THE Abſurdity and Idolatry OF Hoſt-Worſhip,

PROVED,

By ſhewing how it anſwers what is ſaid in Scripture and the Writings of the Fathers, to ſhew the Folly and Idolatry committed in the Worſhip of the Heathen Deities.

ALSO

A full Anſwer to all thoſe Pleas by which Papiſts would wipe off the charge of Idolatry.

And an APPENDIX againſt Tranſubſtantiation; with ſome Reflexions on a late Popiſh Book called *The Guide in Controverſies.*

By *DANIEL WHITBY*, D.D. Chantor of the Church of *Sarum.*

The ſaying of *Averroes.*

I have Travelled the World, and found divers Sects in it, but none ſo fooliſh as that Sect of Chriſtians who eat the God whom they worſhip. Dionyſ. Carthuſ. in Sent. 4. Diſt. 10. Art. 1.

LONDON:

Printed for *H. Brome* at the Gun in St. *Pauls* Church-Yard, *R. Bentley* and *M. Magnes* in *Ruſſel*ſtreet Covent-Garden. 1679.

UG 933.5
W57

THE PREFACE.

FInding *that* Roman Catholicks *are much displeased at us for saying and maintaining that they are guilty of* Idolatry, *and for making Laws, and wholsom Constitutions forbidding them to practise that* Idolatry *within our* Realms, *I have these things offer in our own defence:*

1. *That their displeasure is unjust, and thwarts that* Golden Rule *of Nature, which saith,* do not you that to others which you are not willing they should do to you. *For they do peremptorily conclude that* Protestants *are guilty of* Idolatry, *and therefore ought not to be angry if we return the charge upon them. Their* Casuists *and* Schoolmen *do frequently declare that*

Peccant contrà hoc mandatum, Athei, Apostatæ, Judæi, Turcæ, Hæretici. Esth. in Sent. l. 3. dist. §. §1

Hereticks *are guilty of violation of that Precept which ſaith,* I am the Lord thy God, thou ſhalt have no other Gods but me. *This Doctrine is delivered in the* Roman Catechiſm, *and ſo it is that Doctrine which they are obliged to own and vindicate. Now if they do affirm that we are guilty of this crime by having other gods, they do then manifeſtly ſay that we are guilty of* Idolatry: *But if they do conceive us to offend againſt this Precept, as it injoins us to acknowledg God to be our God, they muſt conceive us to be* Atheiſts; *and if they think it fit to paſs ſo heavy and ſevere a cenſure upon us, why ſhould they take it ill that we accuſe them of a leſſer crime, with better evidence?*

Peccant in hoc præceptum qui in Hæreſin labuntur. Part. 3. c. 2. §. 7.

2. *I add that our Superiours have only done their duty in making of thoſe Laws which do forbid the practice of their* Idolatry *within this* Nation. *For if the* Magiſtrate *be keeper of both the Tables of the Moral Law, if it concern*

cern him to ſee that all his Subjects do perform thoſe great duties which they owe to God and man, he cannot duly execute his Office, or be faithful to the truſt committed to him whilſt he permits the violation of the firſt, and chiefeſt Precept of that Law; but muſt by ſuffering God to be diſhonored in ſo high a manner, when it is in his power to hinder it, make himſelf partaker of other mens ſins. *And if Magiſtrates may ſuffer God to be diſhonored in this kind, I know not why we ſhould conceive them bound to puniſh Thefts, Schiſms, Hereſies, or Infidelity, which crimes the Church of* Rome *excites the* Magiſtrate *to puniſh with extreme ſeverity. If we conſult the Law of* Moſes, *we ſhall there find that God did frequently forbid* Idolatry *under the utmoſt and ſevereſt penalties. The Books of* Samuel, *and of the* Kings *give us continual inſtances of Gods diſpleaſure againſt thoſe* Kings *of* Iſrael *and* Judah, *who did countenance* Idolatry,

latry, *or who neglected to remove it out of their Dominions. And ſutable to their proceedings was the conſtant practice of the firſt Chriſtian* Emperors. *Chriſt fully doth acknowledg that the Church of* Pergamus *held faſt his name, and yet he doth object this to her as an hainous and provoking crime, that ſhe had thoſe amongſt her* who held the Doctrine of *Balaam*, and taught men to eat things Sacrificed unto Idols, and to commit Fornication. *The Church of* Thyatira *was eminent for Faith, Charity, and Patience, and for proficiency in the ways of Piety, and yet our* Saviour *ſpeaks thus to her*, I have ſome few things againſt thee, becauſe thou ſuffereſt that woman *Jezebel* which calleth herſelf a Propheteſs, to teach and to ſeduce my ſervants to commit Fornication and to eat things Sacrificed to *Idols*.

Rev. ii. 14.

Rev. ii. 20.

Serm. before the Parliament. p 42, 43.

In the ſecond of Judges (*they are the words of the Reverend and Learned Biſhop*

Biſhop Uſher) God tells the Children of *Iſrael* what miſchief ſhould come to them by tolerating the *Canaanitiſh Idolaters* in the Land, *they ſhall be thorns in their ſides*, ſaith he, *and their Gods ſhall be a ſnare to you.* Which words contain in them an intimation of a double danger, the one reſpecting the *Soul*, the other the *Body*; that which concerns the Soul, is that their Idols ſhall be *a ſnare unto them*, for God well knew that mans nature is as prone to Spiritual Fornication, as it is to Corporal, as therefore for the preventing of the one he would not have a common Harlot tolerated in *Iſrael*, *leſt the Land* Lev. xix. 29. *ſhould fall to Whoredom*, ſo for the keeping out of the other, he would have provocations taken away, and all occaſions whereby a man might be tempted to commit ſo vile a ſin. *The bodily danger that followeth upon the toleration of Idolaters*

is

Numb. xxxiii. 55. *is* that they ſhall be pricks in their eyes, and thorns in their ſides, and ſhould vex them in the land wherein they dwelt. *Now in both theſe reſpects it is certain that the toleration of the* Idolaters *with whom we have to do is far more perillous than of any other, in regard of the ſpiritual danger wherewith ſimple ſouls are more like to be enſnared, becauſe this kind of* Idolatry *is not brought in with an open ſhew of impiety, as that of the* Pagans, *but is a myſtery of iniquity, a wickedneſs covered with the veil of Piety; and the Harlot which maketh the inhabitants of the earth drunk with the wine of this fornication, is both gilded herſelf, and preſenteth alſo her abominations to her followers in a cup of Gold. If we look to outward peril, we are like to find theſe men not* thorns in our ſides *to vex us, but* daggers in our hearts *to deſtroy us, not that I take all of them to be of this furious diſpoſition, but becauſe there are never wanting among them ſome turbulent*

lent humors ſo enflamed with the ſpirit of Fornication that they run mad with it, and are ſo far tranſported that no tolerable terms can content them, until they have attained to the utmoſt pitch of their unbridled deſires, for compaſſing whereof there is no Treachery, nor Rebellion, nor Murther, nor deſperate courſe whatſoever, that without all remorſe of Conſcience they dare not adventure upon; and whether we have not juſt cauſe to ſay, as did our Saviour in another caſe, This day theſe words have been fulfilled in our ears, *I leave it to the diſcerning Reader to conſider.*

Let it be therefore manifeſted that our Church hath erred in paſſing of this heavy ſentence on the Church of Rome, *that in her adoration of the* Hoſt, *and her* Maſs-Worſhip *ſhe commits* Idolatry, *or elſe it muſt be granted that we ſtand obliged in intereſt and duty to ſuppreſs that* Worſhip.

And whereas ſome who are called members of the Church of England, *rather*

rather chuſe to ſay the Church of Rome *is in this worſhip guilty of* Superſtition, *than* Idolatry, *I hope, they only chuſe to ſay the ſame thing which we do, in a milder phraſe; for they well know that* Superſtition, *both in the* Scripture, *and in the language of the* Antient Fathers, *doth ſignifie* Idolatry. The Superſtitious perſon, *ſaith Heſychius*, is a worſhipper of Idols, an Idolater. He, *ſaith Clemens*, is the ſuperſtitious man who is a worſhipper of Demons, and who advanceth Wood, and Stone, and Spirits into the number of the Gods. *And when St.* Paul *perceived that* Athens *was* a City full of Idols, *he crys out*, I perceive you are too ſuperſtitious. Act. xvii. 22. *The Heathen worſhip is by* Euſebius *ſtiled*, the ſuperſtitious error of the old Idolatry. *And* Origen *declares that the Philoſophy of* Plato *was not ſufficient to divert men from* that which Chriſtians call Idolatry, and others Superſtition.

Δεισιδαίμων ὁ τὰ εἴδωλα σέβων, εἰδωλολάτρης.

Δεισιδαίμων δὲ ὁ δεδίως τὰ δαιμόνια, ὁ πάντα θειάζων καὶ ξύλον καὶ λίθον, &c. Strom. l. 7. p. 701.

Κατείδωλον οὖσαν τὴν πόλιν. v. 16.

Δεισιδαιμονέστεροι. Prepar. Evang. l. 1. c 5. p. 14. B. p. 16.

Τῇ ὡς ἡμεῖς ὀνομάζομεν εἰδωλολατρείᾳ ὡς δὲ καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ λέγοιεν ἂν χρώμενοι τῷ ὀνόματι καὶ τῇ δεισιδαιμονίᾳ. Contr. Celſ. l. 6. p. 287.

We

We ought, I humbly conceive, to make this charitable conſtruction of their words who have ſubſcribed and yielded their aſſent and conſent to that Rubrick *after the* Communion, *which ſpeaks thus:* The Sacramental Bread and Wine remain ſtill in their very natural ſubſtances, and therefore may not be adored; for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all Faithful Chriſtians. *Who, ſecondly, do own the* Canons *and* Conſtitutions *of the Convocation held* A. D. 1640. *and publiſhed by the* Authority *of our* Royal Martyr, Charles *the Firſt*, for the due obſervation of them, *and which inform us, that* at the time of Reforming this Church from that groſs Superſtition of *Popery*, it was carefully provided that all means ſhould be uſed to root out of the minds of the people, both the inclination thereunto; and memory thereof, *eſpecially of the Idolatry committed in the Maſs*, for which

which cauſe all Popiſh Altars were demoliſhed. *Who, thirdly, do affirm that the* Firſt *and* Second Book of Homilies (*which above twenty times do charge the Church of* Rome *with* groſs Idolatry, *and in particular do mention* the groſs Idolatry of Mummiſh Maſſing) contain a Godly and a wholſom Doctrine. *Who, fourthly, do ſubſcribe and hold,* that the Sacrament of the Lords Supper was not by Chriſts Ordinance reſerved, carried about, lifted up, and worſhipped; *and therefore muſt believe that when in their Proceſſions it is worſhipped by the Romaniſts as God, Chriſt is not preſent there, and ſo the Creature only is then adored as a God. And this is all which I thing meet to ſay by way of Preface to this little Book.*

Hom. of the peril of Idolatry.
Hom. of the Sacrament, Part the firſt.
Art. 35.
Art. 28.

CHAP.

Errata in the Book.

PAge 14. *Line* 31. which, *Read* we, *p.* 30. *l.* 8. *del.* that, *p.* 36. *l.* 9. which *r.* with, *p.* 62. *l.* 15. the *r.* this, *ſo p.* 65. *l.* 20. *p.* 126. *l.* 24. *p.* 83. *l.* 14. *add* (3.) *p.* 113. *l.* 4. *add* ſuch. *p.* 130. *l.* 28. Taruſius *r.* Taraſius, *p.* 113. *l.* 1. Deacons *r.* Demons, *p.* 142. *l.* 22. their *r.* there.

In the Margent.

P. 75. conſentiebant *dele* con, *p* 84. & deinceps, Brienω *r.* Brierw, *p.* 91. Græca *r.* Græcus, *p.* 101. quam *r.* quia, *p.* 128. qua *r.* quia.

In the Appendix.

P. 59. *l.* 12. their *r.* her, *p.* 63. *l.* 20. by *r.* be, *p.* 67. *l.* 21. their *r.* your, *ſo p.* 97. *l.* 14. *p.* 84. *l.* 18. about *r.* but, *p.* 92. *l.* 18. to *r.* do, *p.* 95. *l.* 19. *add* he ſaith, *p.* 98. *l.* 20. Charters *r.* Chartres. *p.* 106. *l.* 21. theſe *r.* thoſe, *l.* 22. ſeem *r.* ſeemd, *l.* 25. none *r.* not, *p.* 115. *l.* 30. *add* (4.) *p.* 118. *l.* 28. Deſſius *r.* Leſſius, *p.* 119. *l.* 1. *add* (7.) *l.* 2. by *r.* of, *p.* 122. *l.* 17. to *r.* of, *l.* 32. if *r.* it. *Marg. p.* 78. verbe *r.* urbe.

CHAP. I.

The Contents.

The Introduction §. I. *The* Trent *Council teacheth that the Hoſt or Sacrament is to be Worſhipped with* Latria, *as being truly God.* §. II. *And yet this Council doth acknowledg that by Chriſts Precept the Communicants do eat, and ſome of them do drink the Sacrament.* §. II. *Heathens, Jews, Chriſtians do all pronounce it the extremity of folly to ſay or think that any man can eat his God.* §. III. *The* Trent *Council teacheth that Chriſt is truly Sacrificed by their Prieſts.* §. IV. *To the Antient Fathers nothing did ſeem more brutiſh and abſurd than to Worſhip as a God what men did Sacrifice, or Sacrifice what they did Worſhip as a God.* §. V. *The ſubſtance of the Sacrament being Chriſt truly God according to the Doctrine of the* Roman *Church, whatſoever truly is affirmed of it muſt alſo truly be affirmed of our Bleſſed Lord.* §. VI. *The Prophets and the Fathers deride the Heathen Gods.* (1.) *Becauſe they are carried upon mens ſhoulders, they cannot go, and if they fall, they cannot riſe up again.* §. VII. (2.) *becauſe they may be carried Captive, and are not able to deliver or preſerve themſelves.* §. VIII. (3.) *Becauſe they needed to be preſerved by Officers appointed for that purpoſe under Lock and Key, and to be vindicated by their own votaries.* §. IX. (4.) *Becauſe in times of war and danger their Prieſts did hide them, and ſomtimes bury them in the*

earth. §. X. (5.) *Because they were exposed to injuries of Fire, and consumed by it.* §. XI. (6.) *Because they were exposed to Rust and Moth, to Corruption, and the Injuries of the Weather.* §. XII. (7.) *Because they seemed to be contemned by those very Brutes who dung'd and gnaw'd upon them,* &c. §. XIII. *Upon all these accounts the Host,* or Roman *God, is subject to the like derision, from* §. VII. *to the* XIII.

§. I. THE Holy *Prophets* make it their business to represent those *Deities* the *Heathens* Worshipped as impotent and lying vanities, and things most worthy of derision and contempt, but most unworthy to be Venerated: and thence conclude that that they who paid their Homage to them, were persons void of understanding and consideration, and given up to a judicial blindness. This is so largely represented by them, upon two accounts which more immediately did respect the Jewish Nation.

1. That when they were to go into Captivity, and to be mixed with those *Heathens*, by whom these foolish *Deities* were Worshipped, they might be kept from learning of their ways.

Baruch vi.4,5. When you shall come to *Babylon*, saith *Jeremy*, *there you shall see Gods of Silver, Gold,* and *Wood*, which *create terror to the Heathens*, *and which are carried upon shoulders*; *fear therefore lest you should be conformed to the Aliens, and be possessed with the dread of them, seeing the multitude before and behind that worship them.*

2. That they who had already been seduced to the Worship of them, might be reclaimed by the consideration of so great a folly, and be induced

duced to return unto the Worſhip of the True and Only God. *Beware you be not like unto theſe Aliens, but ſay within thy heart, I ought to worſhip thee, O Lord.* V. 6.

And if thoſe *Jews* who, in this manner have tranſgreſſed, ſay theſe *Prophets*, will but remember that *Bel* and *Nebo*, and all other *Heathen Deities* are born upon mens ſhoulders, or the backs of beaſts; that where they place them there they ſtand, and are not able to remove from thence, that they themſelves are ſomtimes carried Captives, not being able to work deliverance for themſelves; If they remember this, and act like men, they muſt for ever be ſecure from theſe deluſions. In Complyance with this practice of the Sacred Writers, the *Chriſtian Fathers* in their *Apologies*, and other writings of the like nature, have uſed the ſame *Topicks*, the more effectually to reclaim the world from *Heatheniſh Idolatry*, ſmartly deriding the impotency of the *Gods* they worſhipped, and ſcoffing at the folly of that Homage which they paid unto them.

If therefore that which the inſpired *Prophets* and *Primitive Profeſſors* of the *Chriſtian* Faith, did ſo unanimouſly produce, (in plain deriſion of the *Heathen Deities*, and whereby they endeavoured to demonſtrate that they could not be truly Gods) doth equally concern that *Hoſt* which by the Church of *Rome*, and the *Trent Council* is declared to be the *Chriſtians God*, and which on that preſumption they require all Chriſtians to worſhip with *Latria*, or with the Worſhip which peculiarly belongeth to the God of Heaven; as by applying what the Holy *Prophets*, and *Primitive Chriſtians* have alledged a-

gainſt the Worſhip of the *Heathen Deities*, unto the *Hoſt*, will be extremely evident; it follows undeniably that they who are not yet ſeduced to pay this Worſhip to the *Hoſt*, muſt have ſufficient reaſon to abſtain from it; and alſo that they who have already been induced to pay this Homage to it, muſt have as powerful motives to reclaim them from ſo great a folly, as either *Jew* or *Gentile* had to renounce the Worſhip of their *Heathen Idols*.

And now to make the matter evident beyond all reaſonable contradiction, I ſhall proceed to draw the Parallel betwixt the Adoration of the *Romiſh Hoſt*, and that of *Heathen Deities*, ſo much derided by the *Jewiſh Prophets*, and the *Chriſtian Doctors*.

L. 5. p. 170. And this I ſhall attempt, as ſaith *Arnobius*, in a Caſe like this, "not that I take delight in "thus expoſing of the *Romiſh Myſteries*, or re- "preſenting of their Faith ridiculous; but that "the *Romaniſts* themſelves may plainly ſee what "injury they caſt upon their *bon Dieu*, *of whom they are the Worſhippers, the Keepers, and Avengers*.

§. II. 1. Therefore the [a] *Trent Council* teacheth, that *it is not to be doubted in the leaſt but that all Faithful Chriſtians ſhould exhibit the Worſhip of Latria to the Holy Sacrament*, that is, the Conſecrated Wafer, even that Worſhip which is due to God alone, and they pronounce *Anathema* againſt all perſons who aſſert the contrary.

[a] *Nullis itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Chriſti fideles pro more in Catholicâ Eccleſiâ ſemper recepto, (N. B.) Latriæ cultum, quâ verò debetur Deo, huic Sanctiſſimo Sacramento in veneratione exhibeant; neque enim ideo minùs adorandum eſt, quòd fuerit à Chriſto, ut ſumatur inſtitutum.* Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 13. cap. 5.

2. The

2. The reaſons of this determination they aſſign in the enſuing words, [b] *for we believe the ſame God is preſent in the Hoſt, of whom the Father ſaid, let all the Angels of God* Worſhip him, *and whom the wiſe men of the Eaſt, and the Apoſtles Worſhipped.* And therefore the firſt *Canon* of the thirteenth *Seſſion* of that Council declareth, that [c] *if any perſon ſaith that in the Sacrament of the Holy Euchariſt Chriſts body and his blood together* with his *Soul, and his divinity, and ſo whole Chriſt, is not ſubſtantially contained, let him be accurſed.* And accordingly in the [d] *Rythm* of St. *Thomas* to the *Holy Euchariſt*, they ſpeak thus, Deum meum te confiteor, *I confeſs thee to be my God.* Their Tenet therefore plainly is this, *That the Conſecrated Wafer is God united to the man Chriſt Jeſus, latent under the ſpecies of bread.*

[b] *Nam illum eundem Deum præſentem in eo credimus adeſſe, quem pater æternus introducens in orbem terrarum, dicit,* & adorent eum omnes Angeli Dei. *Quem Magi procidentes adoraverunt; quem denique in Galilæa ab Apoſtolis adoratum fuiſſe, Scriptura teſtatur.* ibid.

[c] *Si quis negaverit, in Sanctiſſimæ Euchariſtiæ Sacramento contineri verè, realiter & ſubſtantialiter Corpus & ſanguinem unà cum anima & Divinitate Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, ac perinde totum Chriſtum, anathema ſit,* 1. Can. [d] *Orat. poſt miſſam.*

3. Hence it muſt follow that, ſeeing they do eat this Conſecrated *Wafer*, which is as truly *God* and man as Chriſt now glorified is, *they do profeſſedly eat the God they Worſhip*; and that you may not doubt of this, the *Council* doth immediately ſubjoyn theſe words to the forementioned determination touching the Worſhip due unto the *Hoſt*, *the Sacrament is not the leſs to be ador'd, becauſe, according to the inſtitution of it, it is to be eaten.* Seſſ 13. Cap. 5. vid. Supra.

4. Hence it doth alſo follow, that ſeeing they do drink what is contained in the Conſecrated *Chalice*, and that according to their Doctrine, is whole *Chriſt*, God and man, contained under the

Species of Wine; I say, hence it doth clearly follow, that they drink their *God*. This is the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, most faithfully discovered to you from their *Authentick Records*, and if it only did assert that *Christians* stood oblig'd to be *Cannibals*, to eat mans flesh, and drink down human blood; even this assertion would contain what is repugnant to the nature of man, what hath been constantly esteemed by the sober *Heathens*, a barbarous and inhuman thing; and lastly that which by the *Antient Fathers* was disclaimed and rejected with the greatest horror. But then if we conceive the person who is thus devoured to be also *God*, and therefore look upon this action as θεοφαγία the eating of our God and Maker, it is so full of horror, scandal, and amazement, that nothing can be more prodigious, or more blasphemously prophane, *Heathens*, *Mahumetans*, *Jews*, *Christians*, have with one voice declared that *it is a demonstration of the extremity of madness, and stupidity, for any man to worship what he eats, or eat what he doth Worship*; (*i.e.*) to worship as the Church of *Rome* commands all men to worship under the highest penalties, and therefore it is *plain Phrensie* to imagine the determination of the *Trent* Council, and the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* to be agreeable to truth.

When we call Wine Bacchus, *saith* Cicero, *and our Fruits* Ceres, *we use the* * *common mode of speaking, but do you think any of us so mad as to imagine that which he eats to be his God? Averroes* was a learned *Heathen*, who flourished about the XI. *Century* when this portentous Doctrine first obtained

* *Cum fruges* Cererem, *vinum* Liberum *dicimus, genere nos quidem Sermonis utimur usitato: Sed eo quam tam amentem esse putas, qui illud quo vescatur Deum credat esse?* Cicero Nat. Deor. Lib. 3.

tained in the *Christian* World, which he could not forbear to brand in this sort, [b] *I have enquired into all Religions and have found none more foolish than the Christians, because that very God they worship, they with their teeth devour*, and thus he concludes, *because the Christians eat what they do worship, let my soul go to Philosophers.* And *Bellarmin* himself confesseth that *this amongst the Infidels was always judged to be stultissimum paradoxum, as from the words*, saith he, *of* Averroes *doth appear.* Hence as the highest calumny which the *Mahumetans* can cast upon us, we are by them reproached as Θεόφαγοι or *the Devourers of our God.* And *Mounsieur La Boulay* informs us that being angry with him, they amongst other names of infamy, did call him *Infidel*, and *Mange Dieu* (i. e.) *an Eater of his God.* Nay they affirm that by thus eating of his flesh the *Christians* use him worse than did the *Jews* that Crucified him, *because*, say they, *it is more salvage to eat his flesh and drink his blood, than only to procure his death*: the *Prophet Jeremy* in his Epistle to the Captive *Jews*, informs them that what the *Babylonians* worshipped *should afterwards be eaten*, and *by this*, saith he, *you may know they are no Gods*; Why therefore should not the same argument suffice to shew the vanity of the supposed Godhead of the *Host*? If (as it follows there) these Gods which shall be eaten be a reproach unto the Country where they are adored, this *Romish God* must be a great reproach to all those *Christian* Countrys where he is eaten, and adored. Some of the Antient *Fathers* do represent this as the *extremity of folly*, that men should worship that which other *Nations* eat: *If it be pious for all to worship God*, saith

[b] *Apud Perron. de Euch. l. 3. cap. 29. p. 973. Vide etiam 12. Mitaph.*

Lib. 2. de Euch. Cap. 12. §. 2.

Voyag. Part. 1: cap. 10. p. 21. *Acmed. Ben. Edris apud Hosing. Hist. Eccles.* Sec. 16. par. 2. p. 160.

Baruch, vi. 72.

Contra Celsum. 6. p. 249. *Origen, according to the custom of their Country, as* Celsus *pleads, then must some worship that which by other Nations is destroyed, or eaten, and consumed at meals; for some esteem it pious to worship a Crocodile, and to devour that which is adored by others, some count it piety to adore a Calf, and others to Deifie a Goat; and would not these things introduce a great confusion into the Laws of Justice, Piety, and Religion?* This *Athanasius* reckons as an instance of the abominable, and the repugnant worship of the *Ægyptians*, *that the same Fish which some of them did Consecrate as a God, was made the food of others; The Ægyptians* (saith he) *do adore a Calf, the* Lybians *worship Sheep, both which in other Nations are sacrificed and fed upon, this,* saith he, *is a certain indication of the folly of the Heathen worship*, can we then possibly conceive these very *Christians* did dayly worship as their God, what they themselves and others who participated with them, did continually eat? Moreover some of the *Fathers* do represent this as the most evident conviction of the folly of the *Heathen Worship and Religion*, that they devoured what they themselves adored; *Do you not worship, and also feed upon an Ox which you call Apis,* saith *Minutius, and is not this as great a folly as the worship of an Asses-head which* without shew of reason you object against us *Christians? They* saith *Theodoret*) who *changed the image of the incorruptible God into the likeness of birds, and beasts, and creeping things, should have considered that some of those beasts were eaten by them*; and should not they by parity of reason who adore the *Host* as their Creator and their incorruptible God, consider that this *Host* is eaten by them? *but they,* saith he, *through the extremity of*

Contra Gentes. p. 25, 26.

Nonne & Apim bovem cum Ægyptiis adoratis & pascitis? p. 32.

Ἐξ ἀβελτηρίας καὶ παραπληξίας ἐσχάτης. Theodoret. Com. in Rom. i. 23.

of madness and stupidity, did Deifie the Images of that God which themselves have eaten, and if the *Host* which they themselves confess to be truly stiled the Image of our Lord, be worshipped as a *God*, and eaten by them, must not the *Romanists* betruly charged with like stupidity and madness? 3. Some of the *Fathers* do expresly say that *'tis the extremity of madness to worship what we eat*; and that *God by the prohibition of unclean beasts, and by permitting his own people to eat the clean, designed to preserve them from the irrational folly of the Heathens, who worshipped birds and beasts*, &c. *God*, saith *Theodoret*, *seeing that men would fall to such extremity of madness as to worship beasts as Gods, the better to restrain that wickedness, permitted that they should be eaten*; which in the judgment of *Theodoret* was the most natural preservative against this mad *Idolatry*; *because*, saith he, *it is the highest folly or stupidity to worship what is eaten*; *God therefore doth pronounce some living creatures clean, and some unclean, that abhorring the unclean they might not Deifie them.* Again he adds, that *God pronouncing some beasts unclean, and others clean, persuades us not to think that any of them could be Gods*; *for how can any man of sense think that to be a God which he abominates as unclean, or which is offered to the true God, and eaten by himself.* He farther saith, that *God enjoyned the Jews to eat those Creatures which the* Ægyptians *worshipped as Gods, that they might be induced to despise what they did eat. For knowing that they were superstitious, and yet were lovers of their Guts, he cures one Disease by another, and to their supperstition he doth oppose their appetites*; *for, causing them to abstain from Swines flesh as unclean*, which was the only flesh, the

Ἀβελτηρίας γὰρ ἐσχάτης τὸ ἐσθιόμενον προσκυνεῖν. qu. 55. *in Genes.*

Quest. XI. *in Levit.* p. 104. D.

Ser. 7. *ad Græcos Infideles.* p. 150. ed. Sylb.

Ægyptians

Ægyptians fed upon, *and by his Law permitting them to eat of other creatures, as being clean; he constrained them through lusting after flesh, to eat of the supposed Ægyptian Gods*: The Author of the Questions and Answers to the *Orthodox* speaks to the same effect; *viz.* that *because in* Ægypt *all beasts were Deified, excepting Swine, God therefore calls some of them unclean, some clean; and did permit them to Sacrifice clean beasts, forbidding them to eat of the unclean, by both these things shewing they were unworthy of the name and honor of the Deiey, both because they were sacrificed and eaten, and because they were called unclean.* Sith then the *Roman Host* is sacrificed and eaten, it must, by parity of Reason, be unworthy of the name and worship of a *Deity*. If God by permitting of his people to eat clean beasts, demonstrated to them that they could not be Gods, he, by commanding all *Christians* to eat the *Host*, must have demonstrated to them it is no *God*. If it be the extremity of madness to worship what is eaten by us; and if no man of wisdom can conceive that to be God, the *Romanists* must then be persons void of sense, and guilty of extremity of madness. Since then the Antient *Fathers* did pass as deep a censure on this *God-eating*, as did the wiser *Heathens*, *Turks*, *and Jews*, it must be certain that this new *Article* of the *Romish Faith*, *that the same Jesus whom they dayly worship, is also to be eaten, by all faithful Christians*, was utterly unknown in their days.

Δεικνύων αὐτὰ ἀνάξια ὄντα τῆς Θεοῦ προσηγορίας τὰ καὶ τιμῶς καὶ διὰ τοῦ Θύεσθαι καὶ ἐσθίεσθαι. *Resp. ad Quæst.* 35. p. 412, 413.

Again,

§. IV.

Again, The same [a] *Trent Council* teacheth *that Christ hath instituted that he himself should still be Sacrificed in the Church; or offered by the Priest under the signs of Bread and Wine:* he therefore being God and man, he must have instituted the oblation of *God-man* to be continued in his *Church.*

[a] *Corpus & sanguinem suum sub speciebus panis & vini Deo Patri obtulit; ac sub earundem rerum symbolis, Apostolis, quos tunc novi Testamenti sacerdotes constituebat, ut sumerent tradidit; & eisdem, eorúmque in sacerdotio successoribus, ut offerrent præcepit per hæc verba, Hoc facite.* Sess. 22. Cap. 1.

2. They teach, *that the oblation which Christ once made upon the Cross, and which the Priest doth dayly make upon the Altar, is one and the same oblation:* and so the same *God-man* is offered by the *Priest.* They also do expresly teach, that what they offer [b] *is to be worshiped with Latria,* the worship proper to the God of Heaven.

Una enim eademque est Hostia. Sess. 22. Cap. 2.

[b] *Si quis dixerit in Sancto Eucharistiæ Sacramento Christum unigenitum Dei filium non esse cultu Latriæ, etiam externo, adorandum, Anathema sit.* Sess. 13. Cap. 8. Can. 6.

§. V.

Now to the *Antient Fathers* nothing did seem more brutish and absurd than to esteem and worship as a God what men did Sacrifice. *Why are you Sacrilegious against your Gods,* saith *Tatian, (as certainly you are) for you Sacrifice a Sheep and yet you worship it: you have a Bull in the Heavens and you Sacrifice the likeness of him. The* Greeks *being ignorant of God,* saith *Clemens, not knowing him with that perfect knowledg which the Christians have, they worship those things which God hath given them for meat, the Fowls of the Air,* the *Fishes of the Sea, the Beasts of the Field, and they Sacrifice their own food:* and must not then the *Romanist* be also ignorant

Θύεις πρόβατον τὸ δ' αὐτὸ προσκυνεῖς, &c. p. 149.

Σέβονται καὶ ἃ δέδωκεν εἰς βρῶσιν ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ τὰ ἴδια βρώματα βροτοῖς θύματα θύουσιν. Clem. Strom. l. 6. p. 635.

rant of the true *Christian* knowledg of God, who doth both Sacrifice and Worship what God hath given him to eat? *You do object against us Christians*, saith [a] *Minutius*, *the worship of an Asses head, Who is so fooliſh as to worſhip it, or to conceive that others worſhip it, unleſs it be your ſelves, who do both Sacrifice and Worſhip the heads of Oxen and of Rams? That the* Ægyptians *did not conceive their Oxen to be Gods is very manifeſt*, ſaith Euſebius, *becauſe they in their worſhip of the Gods did often Sacrifice them. This is a certain indication*, ſaith *Athanaſius*, *of the folly and Atheiſm of the Heathen worſhip, and an aſſurance that it cannot long ſubſiſt, that what One Nation doth eſteem a God, another Sacrificeth, and what One Nation Sacrificeth another worſhipeth as a God; for though they do not Sacrifice thoſe very numerical Calves, and Sheep which they have Conſecrated as Gods, yet ſince they Sacrifice the like in kind, they ſeem to Sacrifice the ſame. The* Indians *worſhip Wine under the name of* Bacchus, *whilſt others Sacrifice it to their Gods; the* Ægyptians *do adore a Calf, the* Lybians *worſhip Sheep, both which in other Nations are Sacrificed and fed upon. There is ſcarce a God in* Ægypt *who is not Sacrificed to Deities of other Countrys, ſo that they well deſerve to be the laughing ſtock of other Nations becauſe they worſhip as a God not only what other Nations, but what themſelves do offer as a Propitiatory Sacrifice. God ſhews clean beaſts to be unworthy of the name and honor of a Deity, becauſe that they are Sacrificed*, ſaith *Pſeudo-Juſtin*. Laſtly *Theodoret* declares that *God did therefore cauſe the Jews to Sacrifice thoſe beaſts, which they before had worſhipped in* Ægypt, *that by ſo doing they might learn not to eſteem as Gods thoſe things which they*

[a] *Boum capita, & capita vrvecum, & immolatis & colitis.* Minuc. p. 32.

Præpar. Evang. L. 3. Cap. 12.

Contra Gentes. p. 26.

Quæſt. & Reſp. ad Orthod.

Quæſt. 35. *vide ſupra. Adv. Græcos Serm. de Sacrif.* p. 105.

they were wont to Sacrifice, and offer to him; this remedy, ſaith he, *their wiſe Phyſitian did preſcribe for their* Ægyptian *malady.* From all which paſſages it is extremely evident that to eſteem or worſhip that as God which we do Sacrifice, is in the judgment of the Antient *Chriſtians*, to be Sacrilegious againſt God, and ignorant of the true knowledg of God; tis to be guilty of no leſs than folly and *Atheiſm*; 'tis as abſurd as the worſhip of an Aſſes head; 'tis that which juſtly renders men a laughing ſtock to all their neighbors; and therefore 'tis manifeſt that *Roman Catholicks*, the greateſt part of whoſe devotion conſiſts in this *Maſs-Service*, this Sacrificing of that God they worſhip, muſt in the judgment of theſe *Fathers* be lyable to all thoſe imputations. And ſeeing the Fathers do declare that God by permitting men to eat, and by commanding them to Sacrifice clean beaſts, deſigned to convince them that they were unworthy the name and worſhip of the Deity, and to inſtruct them not to eſteem that as a God which they were wont to Sacrifice to God: The Romaniſts by commanding men to eat, and as they alſo do imagine to Sacrifice the *Hoſt*, muſt be ſuppoſed to inſtruct and to convince them, it is unworthy of the name and worſhip of the *Deity*. As therefore *Anaxandrides* ſaid to the *Ægyptians* "*I can have* "*no agreement which you becauſe of the great dif-* "*ference there is betwixt our cuſtoms and thoſe which* "*do obtain among you; for whereas you do worſhip* "*Oxen, I Sacrifice them to the Gods: an Eel is by* "*you honoured as a great God, by me 'tis eaten as* "*delicious meat.* So may we ſay unto the *Romaniſts*, We can have no communion with you, becauſe you worſhip that as a great God, which we do

Βοῦν προσκυνεῖς ἐγὼ δὲ θύω τοῖς θεοῖς. Anaxandr. apud Athenæum l. 7. p. 299.

do eat: and what you Sacrifice (at leaſt in your imagination) we think moſt worthy to be worſhipped, and therefore 'twill be ever far from us to Sacrifice it. 'Twas *an abomination to the* Ægyptians *to eat bread with the Hebrews*, becauſe the *Hebrews* did eat thoſe Cattle which the *Ægyptians* worſhipped, ſaith the *Chaldee Paraphraſe*. And *Moſes* would depart from *Ægypt* before he Sacrificed to his God, leſt he ſhould Sacrifice to the Lord *the abominations of the* Ægyptians *before their eyes (i. e.)* the beaſts which the *Ægyptians* worſhiped, and therefore did abhor to kill, or to ſee killed for Sacrifice. We therefore who alſo do abhor, as all the *Antient Fathers* did, to ſee that Sacrificed and eaten which we adore as God, cannot eat of this Sacred bread with thoſe of *Rome*, but muſt firſt fly from *Babylon*, as it is Propheſied the *Church* ſhould do, before we do commemorate that Sacrifice which they repeat.

Gen. xliii. 32. *Vide Ainſw. in locum.*

Exod. viii. 26.

§. VI. 3. The ſubſtance of the Sacrament being Chriſt truly God and man, according to the Doctrin of the *Roman Church*, whatſoever truly is affirmed of, or doth belong unto the ſubſtance of the Sacrament, muſt alſo be truly affirmed of our Bleſſed Lord. Now if we do compare thoſe things, which are delivered in their *Liturgy*, and moſt *Authentick Records*, touching the *Hoſt*, with what the light of Nature teacheth, and what the *Scriptures*, and the *Holy Fathers* have delivered in deriſion of the *Heathen Gods* which ſhall ſoon find that what the Scriptures and the Holy Fathers have offered to expoſe the *Heathen Gods* to the contempt and indignation of their fooliſh votaries, doth more *emphatically* expoſe that *Hoſt* which by the *Papiſts* is worſhipt as a true God, to the deriſion

I. 5. p. 160.

of

of mankind. And truly as *Arnobius* ſaith in a like caſe, and on like grounds; ſo ſay I here, had the malicious *Jew*, or the vileſt *Infidel*, deſigned to put affronts upon our deareſt Lord, I know not by what method, they could have done it more effectually; ſince the diſguiſes which the *Romaniſts* have put upon him, do certainly expoſe him almoſt to all the ſcoffs which have, or can be caſt upon the worſt of *Idols*: nor did the *Jews*, or *Herod* load him with half the ignominy, which is now caſt upon him by the doctrine and worſhip of the *Roman Church*. §. VII.

And to begin with thoſe conſiderations which the *Prophet Eſa.* doth ſuggeſt. To preſerve the Captive *Jews* from paying homage to *Bel* and other *Babyloniſh Idols*, he informs them, that the *Prieſts bear them on their ſhoulders, they carry them, and ſet them in their places; and where they are thus placed, they ſtand and remove not from it. Remember this*, ſaith he, *and ſhew your ſelves men. They muſt needs be born becauſe they cannot go*, ſaith *Jeremy*, *be not afraid of them.* In his Epiſtle to the Captive *Jews*, the firſt thing he informs them of is this, *that when they come to* Babylon *they ſhall ſee their Gods of Silver, Gold, Wood, born upon ſhoulders, which the Nations fear; beware therefore*, ſaith he, *that you be not afraid of them, when you ſee the multitude behind them, and before them worſhiping them*; and (Verſe 26, 27.) *they are born*, ſaith he, *upon ſhoulders whereby* [N. B.] *they declare to men that they are nothing worth. They alſo that ſerve them are aſhamed, for if they fall to the ground at any time, they cannot riſe up again of themſelves.* The Author of the Book of *Wiſdom* ſaith, *that the Artificer, when he hath made his Idol ſets it in a Wall, and*

Chap. xlvi. 1.

Chap. x. 5.

Bar. vi. 3, 4.

Wiſd. xiii. 16.

and makes it fast with Iron; for he provideth for it that it might not fall, knowing that it was unable to help it self. On this account saith he, they are more to be blamed, than they who worshipped the lights of Heaven, who yet are not to be excused or pardoned. *The Heathen Gods,* saith *Athanasius, have no power to stand, or sit, but must remain in the same posture which the Artificer hath given them, and therefore do afford no Argument or Character of their Divinity. What pardon can they hope for who place their confidence in things unmoveable, and worship them for the true God?* saith the same Father, *They cannot stand being not fastened with pins, and if they be not born by others neither can they go,* so *Theodoret. They are so rude and stupid,* saith St. *Cyril, that they carry up and down their Gods upon their shoulders, they see they are unable to move and are carried whither the bearer pleaseth, and yet they pray unto them, whereas,* saith he, *what help canst thou expect from them whom thou perceivest to be void of sense and motion; but thou art as senseless as they, and fallen into the most extreme stupidity.* And to the like effect speak almost all the *Fathers*, who write in confutation of the *Heathen Deities.*

Θεῶν μὲν γὰρ γνώσεισμα μηδὲν παρέχοντες. Contra Gent. p. 17.

Ibid. p. 16.

Sermon. 10. ad Græcos p. 144.

Cyril in Es. l. 4. p. 629, 630.

And yet these things do perfectly agree as well unto the *Roman Catholicks bon Dieu* as to those *Idols* which the *Heathens worshipped*; for the *Trent Council* hath determined that upon [a] *Corpus Christi day this Host (i. e.)* the *Roman*

[a] *Declarat præterea Sancta Synodus, piè & religiosè admodum in Dei Ecclesiam inductum fuisse hunc morem, ut singulis annis peculiari quodam & festo die præclarum hoc & venerabile Sacramentum singulari veneratione ac solemnitate celebraretur, utque in processionibus reverenter & honorificè illud per vias & loca publica circumferretur.* Sess. 13. Cap. 5.

God,

God, *should be carried in Procession through publick ways and places*, at which times he is born upon their shoulders or their arms, and he must needs be born, because he cannot go, and when they come unto their *tabernacula quietis*, where their God must rest, he standeth in the place, in which they set him, and is not able to remove from thence. They also have determined, [b] *Chapter the 6.* of the same *Session*, *that this God must be carried to sick people*, and knowing that he is unable to help himself, they have provided, as did the *Heathens*, for their *Idols*, that he might not fall, nor be shaken out of the *pyxis* wherein he is kept saith the *Roman Ritual*. Moreover this God falls often to the ground, witness the *Canon* of the *Mass* which doth enjoyn [c] *that if the Consecrated Host doth fall upon the ground, the place on which he falleth shall be washed and somewhat scraped*; witness the reason assigned by the [d] *Roman Catechism*, why the people are Sacrilegiously deprived of the Cup; viz. *lest the blood should be spilt upon the ground.* Witness those other *Canons* which command the *Priest*, when any of the blood doth fall upon the ground, [e] *with reverence to lick it up.* And when this God is fallen, it is certain, that he cannot rise again without their help. Witness the words of the same *Canon* commanding, when the *Host* is fallen, that the *Priest with reverence*

[b] *Porrò deferri ipsam sacram Eucharistiam ad infirmos, & hunc usum diligenter in Ecclesiis conservari cum summâ æquitate & ratione conjunctum est. Quare sanctâ hac Synodus retinendum omnino salutarem hunc & necessarium morem statuit.* Sess. 13. Cap. 6.

——*ut neque decidere, neque è pixide excuti Sacramentum queat. Rituale Rom.* p. 72. Ed. Antuerp. 1617.

[c] *Si hostia, &c. locus ubi cecidit mundetur & aliquantulum abradatur.*

[d] *Primùm enim maximè cavendum erat, ne sanguis Domini in terram funderetur.* Catech. Rom. Part 2. Ch. 4. §. 66.

[e] *Si per negligentiam aliquid sanguinis ceciderit linguâ lambatur —— Si super lapidem ceciderit Altaris, sorbeat sacerdos stillam —— Si hostia consecrata, vel aliqua ejus particula dilabatur in terram reverenter accipiatur.* Can. *de defectibus in Ministerio occurrent.*

ſhould take it up. And may not we then ſay unto the *Romaniſts* as doth the *Prophet Eſa*, *Remember this and ſhew your ſelves men, bring it again to mind, O ye Tranſgreſſors*? May we not hence conclude, according to the *Prophet Jeremy*, that the *Roman Hoſt*, as to its ſuppoſed *Deity*, is nothing worth? And when we ſee the multitude behind it, and before it worſhipping, have we not reaſon to obey the *Prophets* Counſel, and to beware of being like them? Have not all they who ſerve it the ſame cauſe to be aſhamed as had the worſhippers of *Heathen Idols*? are not they equally blame-worthy, inexcuſable, unpardonable, who worſhip that of which all theſe particulars as truly are affirmed, as ever they were ſpoken of the *Heathen Gods*? May we not ſay with *Cyril* that they are rude and fooliſh, as ſenſeleſs as their *Hoſt*, and guilty of extreme ſtupidity?

§. VIII. 2. This *Prophet* laughs at *Bel* and *Nebo*, the *Babyloniſh Idols*, becauſe they might be carried Captive, and were not able to deliver or preEſa. xlvi. 1,2. ſerve themſelves; *Bel*, ſaith he, *boweth down*, Nebo *ſtoopeth, their Idols were upon the Beaſts and upon the Cattel, they could not deliver the burthen, but themſelves are gon into Captivity.* The Prophet *Jeremy*, is very copious on this ſubject, deriding thus the *Heathen Deities*: *he hath in his right hand a Dagger and an Ax, but cannot deliver himſelf from War and Thieves, whereby they are known not to be Gods, therefore fear them not.* Bar. vi. 15, 16. And again Verſe 56, 57. *Moreover they cannot withſtand any King or Enemy, nor are they able to eſcape from Thieves and Rob-*
P. 27. *bers. To adore what thou haſt taken*, ſaith *Minutius*, *is not to Conſecrate a Deity, but thine own Sacrilege*,

Sacrilege. They could not poſſibly be Gods the *Romans* worſhipped, ſaith Tertullian, *becauſe the* Romans *firſt took them Captive, and then worſhipped them, ſo that their ſacrileges were equal to their Trophies; their triumphs over the Gods they worſhipped were as many as over the Nations they had Conquered. Shall not I look on this as a conviction of the impotency of their Idols,* ſaith St. *Clemens, that thieves and enemies can take and ſpoil them? What madneſs is it,* ſaith *Lactantius, to fear that, of which thou feareſt that it may be ſtoln!* And *Chryſoſtom,* upon occaſion of that ſpeech of *Labans* unto *Jacob, Why haſt thou ſtoln away my Gods?* crys out, *O hyperbole of madneſs! Are thy Gods ſuch as can be ſtoln? Art thou not aſhamed to ſay, why haſt thou ſtoln away my Gods? Are thy Gods ſuch, O* Laban, *as being about to be ſtoln are not able to defend themſelves?* *Celſus* makes this objection againſt the *Deity* of *Chriſt, that they cannot eſteem him God, who by the Jews was apprehended, and who, though he fled, was taken, and carried bound to the High-Prieſt,* for 'tis, ſaith he, *unworthy of a God to fly or be led bound or Captive.* And Chriſt himſelf would neither fly, when once his hour was come, nor yet be taken, till he had given ſufficient demonſtration that it was in his power, not only to eſcape from, but alſo to ſtrike dead that band of men which came againſt him. *Whence doth the weakneſs of theſe fictitious Gods appear,* ſaith *Cyril?* In this, ſaith the Prophet, *that they cannot eſcape from War, but are themſelves made Captive, whereas had they been Gods, 'twas fit they ſhould have both preſerved their votaries and ſhewed themſelves ſuperior to their Enemies.* Now that the *Hoſt,* or God of *Roman Catholicks,* hath oft been ſtoln, or ſacrile-

Apol. 1. 25.

Περὶ Πεντ. p. 34. 35.

L. 2. c. 4. p. 154.

Ὦ ἀνοίας ὑπερβολή. *Chryſoſt. Tom.* 1. p. 447.

Apud Orig. l. 2. p. 62.

In Eſa. l. 4. p. 627.

giously taken from the *Altar*, the *Romanists* do not deny: They have had late experience of it, and have severely punished the offenders in that kind: and *Geraldinus* complains to *Charles* the V. and to *Ægidius the Cardinal* much like another *Laban*, that the Sacrament, *the body of his God could not be safe from Thieves, Soothsayers, Magicians, Wizards, or from the fire of the wicked.* That they conceive their God in danger to be stoln or carried Captive, is evident, because they have a *Rubrick* which commands the *Priest*, * *if he fears the incursion of enemies, to make haste to eat him up*, and to secure him in his belly, from the danger imminent; and a Decree made by *Pope* Innocent, *that it be so well kept that no rash hand approach it*: that he already hath been triumphed over by the *Infidels*, as well as other *Roman Gods*, and was not able to withstand the Enemy, is clear from the known History of *Lewis* the IX. who being beaten, and in great distress, even when his *God* was with him, gave him in pawn to the *Ægyptian Sultan*, who still by way of Triumph in his *Escutcheon* bears the likeness of a *Pix* and *Wafer*. Seeing then these things have frequently befallen the *Host*, and when they did, the *Host* did nothing to defend and help it self, may we not put the question to the *Romanist*, as doth *Arnobius* to the *Heathens*, *Where was then their God, was he a sleep, was he snorting, or as perfidious persons use to do, did he fly unto the Enemies Camp?* May we not say as doth the Prophet *Jeremy*, Why do you not perceive that is no God which cannot save it self from War and Thieves? May we not speak unto them in the expressions of *Lactantius*, What madness is it to fear that of which thou feareſt it may be stoln?

Epist. ad Carol. quint. In Itiner.

* *Si timetur incursus hostium, Sacerdos accelerare poterit sumptionem Sacramenti, omissis omnibus aliis. De defectibus Missæ* Cap. 10. *Decretal.* l. 3. Tit. 44. c. 1. *Apud Jovium.*

Dormiebat, stertebat in hostilia castra defugerat! l. 4. p. 129.

ſtoln? May we not cry out with *Chryſoſtom*, O Hyperbole of folly! Are your Gods ſuch as can be ſtoln? O the exceſs of Error, are they ſuch as being ſtoln are not able to defend, or to preſerve themſelves? May we not look on this as a conviction of the impotency of the *Roman God*, as *Clemens* did? May we not know according to the Prophet *Jeremy* he is no God, and therefore is not to be feared? And laſtly may we not admire, as doth the Author of the [b] *Recognitions*, *that men of ſenſe ſhould once conceive that to be God which can be ſtoln.*

[b] *Qui ergo ſuſpicari poſſunt; Iſti hominibus ſenſum habentibus Dii debent videri?* Clem. Recogn. l. 5. Cap. 15. p. 465. C.

§. IX.

3. Scriptures and *Fathers* do plentifully deride the *Heathen Deities*, becauſe they needed to be preſerved and vindicated by their own Votaries, and could not help, preſerve, or vindicate themſelves, when any danger was ready to befal them, or any bold affront was offered to them. And firſt the *Prophet Jeremy* declares the *Heathen Deities* were neither to be feared, nor worſhipped, becauſe their *Prieſts* were forced to preſerve them under Lock and Key; *For as the doors are made faſt on every ſide upon him that offendeth the King, even ſo the Prieſts make faſt their Temples with Doors, with Locks, with Bars, leſt their Gods be ſpoiled by Robbers. O you, if you be certain*, ſaith Arnobius, *that your Gods be in their Images, and dwell there, why do you keep them under Lock and Key, under Bolts and Bars? why in the Cloyſters? why do you protect them from Thieves and Night-Robbers by Church-Wardens, Sextons, and a thouſand Watchmen? If you believe that they are Gods, and that they ſtir not from their Images, ſuffer them to take care of*

Bar. vi. 18.

Adv. Gent. l. p. 205.

themſelves, let the door of your Temple be always unlockt, and if any perſon go about to ſteal them, let them ſhew forth their Divinity by puniſhing the ſacrilege. Do they not ſee, ſaith *Juſtin Martyr, that it is a wicked thing to ſay or think men ſhould be Keepers of their Gods? How are they Gods that are defended by human Laws, and not by their own ſtrength, and who are kept from Thieves by the defence of Cloyſters?* ſaith *Clemens. This is a moſt ſtupendious thing,* ſaith *Athanaſius, that even thoſe whom they preſerve and keep under their Cuſtody, they ſerve, as if they were their Lords. On this account,* ſaith he, *we do deſervedly eſteem them fools that from thoſe Gods they do expect their needs ſhould be ſupplied, who, as they are not ignorant, do need their care. The Prophet,* ſaith St. *Cyril, ſhews the Council of the Jews to be ridiculous, if they do go about to ſave thoſe Gods they worſhip, for if they were Gods indeed, they rather ſhould expect to be preſerved by them. But they, condemning their own ſentiments, and teſtifying their inability to do any thing, ſuccour their Gods. How then can they be Gods, who ſtand in need of the aſſiſtance of their Votaries? They who do adore ſuch Gods are really as ſenſeleſs as their Gods; and it becometh every pious man to bid farewel unto their follies. It is your revenge,* ſaith Cyprian, *which doth defend them when they are hurt, and it is your ſafeguard which keeps them ſhut leſt they ſhould periſh; but is it not a ſhame to worſhip them whom you defend, and to hope for ſafety from them, who by you are kept ſafe?* And *what perverſeneſs is it,* ſaith Lactantius, *to fly for refuge unto them, which when themſelves are violated remain unvindicated, unleſs their Worſhippers revenge them?* Now evident it is, that all theſe things may be as truly

Ἐφ ἅ, ἐμβεγνησίας. &c. Apol. 2. p. 58.

Recogn. l. 5. p. 454. B.

Contra Gentes. p. 15.

Ibid. p. 24.

Com in Eſ. p. 49.

Νοσήσει γὰρ μᾶλλον οἱ θεραπεύοντες οὗτοι ἢ ἴσον αὐτοῖς ἀναιδησίαν. Ibid.

Pudeat tutelam de iis ſperare quos tu ipſe tueris. Cyprian *ad* Demetr. p. 328.

L. 2. c. 4.

ſpoken

ſpoken againſt the *Roman Hoſt*, as againſt any of the *Heathen Deities*. For firſt 'tis known that in the *Roman Church* the *Hoſt* is kept ſafe locked within a Tabernacle; that they have Bolts and Bars, and Locks, they have their Oſtiary and other Officers to Shut, Bolt, and Lock their Churches; There is a Decree of *Innocentius* the third in force amongſt them, [a] *that in all Churches the Hoſt be kept under ſafe cuſtody, leſt any raſh hand ſhould come at it.* This *Hoſt* is therefore under Lock and Key, and hath its Keepers, as much as any *Heathen Idol*; If any perſon doth affront it, when it is carried in *Proceſſion*, or otherwiſe reproach it; it is not left unto the *Hoſt* to puniſh their Prophaneneſs, and to ſhew forth his *Majeſty*, in vindication of himſelf; but he is either vindicated by the Inquiſition, or the Magiſtrate, or by the common Rout, or wholly doth remain unvindicated. May we not then enquire with [b] *Cyprian, What can they do for their Votaries, who do nothing againſt their Contemners?* Muſt it not be ἀδύνατον *a very wicked thing*, according unto *Juſtin Martyr*, for *Romaniſts* to ſay, or think that is their God which they themſelves do keep? May we not upon this account cry out with him ὦ τῆς ἀμαθίας, *O the ſtupor of ſuch men!* Muſt it not be ridiculous in them, according to St. *Cyril*, to conſult its preſervation? Is it not in the judgment of *Athanaſius*, a moſt ſtupendious thing, that they ſhould ſerve that as their *Lord*, which they preſerve, and keep under their cuſtody? Muſt it not be according to St. *Cyprian*, *Lactiantius*, and *Athanaſius*, their ſhame, their folly, their perverſeneſs, to worſhip that which they themſelves defend, and pray to that for ſafety which themſelves keep

[a] *Ut in cunctis Eccleſiis Euchariſtia ſub fidelî cuſtodia conſervetur, ut poſſit ad illam temeraria manus extendi. Decretal. L. 3. Tit. 44. C. 1.*

[b] *Quid præſtare colentibus poſſunt, qui ſe de non colentibus vindicare non paſſunt? D. Cyp. ad Demetr. p. 328.*

ſafe? Laſtly, muſt it not be extremely evident accor ing to St. *Clemens*, and St. *Cyril*, that the *Roman Hoſt*, which needeth the aſſiſtance of its votaries, and is both kept and vindicated by them, cannot be truly God, nor ſo eſteemed by men of ſenſe?

§. X. Bar. vi. 49. 4. Moreover when *there cometh any war upon them*, the Heathen *Prieſts conſult*, ſaith Jeremy, *where they may with their Gods be hidden; how is it then that they perceive not that they be no Gods?*

Eſa ii. 49. Ἱκανῶς αὐτὸν ἐκωμώδησε δεικνὺς μὴ ὄφι θεῶν κρυπτομένους, &c. *in Eſ.* C. 2. Tom. 1. p. 1039. The Prophet *Eſa*, as by the 70. he is tranſlated, and by the *Fathers* Paraphraſed, doth *Propheſie* to the reproach of *Heathen Idols*, that their Votaries ſhould *hide them, bringing them into Dens and Clefts of the Rocks, and holes of the Earth*; and *by declaring*, ſaith St. *Chryſoſtom*, *that they ſhould hide themſelves together with their Gods, and go under the Earth, he doth ſufficiently expoſe or render them ridiculous. Let them be filled with ſhame,* ſaith Cyril, *who ſerve thoſe Gods they hide before themſelves, that they may not periſh being expoſed to the lucre of the Enemy. It is a ridiculous Counſel of the Jews to hide their Gods*, ſaith the ſame Cyril; *for by hiding them in Dens and Holes of the Earth, leſt the Enemy ſhould find and carry them away with other Captives, they condemn their own ſentiments, and teſtifie their Gods are not ſufficient to do any thing.* And yet we know that in the times of perſecution both by the *Heathen Emperors*, and the *Arians*, the Chriſtians and the *Orthodox*, were forced to hide themſelves in Dens, and Caverns of the Earth, and if they then had any uſe or knowledg of the *Romiſh God*, they often muſt have had him with them in the ſame Dens and Caverns. We know that *Romiſh Prieſts* are forced ſtill to hide themſelves and their

In Eſa. p. 51. Εἰ κατακρύπτεσθαι τοὺς θεούς, &c. Vid. Sup.

their *bon Dieu* in all thoſe places, where it is penal to ſay *Maſs*. Nay when they fear an Enemy the *Maſs Prieſt* is commanded to eat up his God, and hide him in his ſtomach. How therefore is it, that they do not perceive he is no God? how is it that they do not ſee with *Chryſoſtom*, that they ſufficiently expoſe him, while they do conceal him? or with St. *Cyril*, that they are ridiculous and men condemned by their own ſentiments, and that they by their practice teſtifie their God is not ſufficient to do any thing? *The Prophet Eſa*, ſaith Theodoret, *doth tragically ſing the downfal of the Heathen Idols, declaring that they ſhall hide the Gods, which they had made, and bring them into Dens and Clefts of the Rocks and Holes of the Earth*; *which Propheſie*, ſaith he, *it becomes not me ſo much to interpret, as you ingeniouſly to confeſs, that which hath often hapned*; *but if you will not do ſo*; *yet is it evident to all who have ſeen often times your Gods, which wicked men had bidden, intending by that concealment to preſerve and ſuccour them, dug out of the Earth by Pious Chriſtians, and publickly expoſed to the ſcorn of women and children*. Now that which here *Theodoret* ſpeaks of the *Heathen Gods*, that they were often buried in the Earth, and dug out thence by *Chriſtians*, that which, ſaith he, the Prophet tragically mentions as the καταλυσις or diſſolution of thoſe *Idols*, hath very often hapned to the *Hoſt*; for by an antient *Cuſtom*, which long prevailed, even againſt many Canons to the contrary, both in the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Churches the *Hoſt* was buried with dead Corps, as *Zonaras* informs us; and *Balſamon* declares that even *in his time the Conſecrated Bread was put into the hand of the* Antiſtes, *and ſo he was committed*

Ad Græcos Infideles, Serm. 10. p. 143, 144.

In Can. 13. *Con. Trul.* ibid.

ted to the Earth; and I my ſelf with many others have ſeen the *Chalice* in which the Sacred Blood was buried, dug up out of the Graves of divers *Biſhops* buried in the Church of *Sarum*. And *Humbert* teſtifies concerning the *Greek Church*, that in the Eleventh *Century* it was their Cuſtom Euchariſtiam ſubterrare, *to bury under ground the remains of the Holy Sacrament*. If then the Prophet *Eſa*, to expreſs the great contempt the *Heathens*, in the times of *Chriſtianity* ſhould offer to their *Idols*, Propheſied, that *they ſhould caſt them to the Moles*, what great contempt muſt they have offered to this *Roman God*, who lodged him with the Moles and Worms, and how unlikely is it that they who did ſo, ſhould believe that what they buried was God? How certain muſt it be that what this *Propheſie* foretold, hath been fulfilled as frequently and truly upon the *Roman Hoſt*, as upon any *Heathen Idols*? How eaſie was it alſo to dig up the *Hoſt*, and to expoſe it to the view; nay that this hath been done, is evident from the relation which *Ivo* makes of the tranſlation of St. *Othmars* body, together with the Sacrament from its own dormitory, to the Church of St. *Gallus*. And therefore all the inferences which the *Fathers* do hence make againſt the *Deity* and worſhip of the *Heathen Gods*, as ſtrongly do conclude againſt the *Hoſt*. Doth *Cyril* ſay, that when they hid them in the Caverns of the Earth, they could not then conceive them to be *Gods*? ſo may we ſay of *Chriſtians*. Doth he ſay of that true God who is over all, that no man ever ſaw him concealed, that he was never hidden, that he never ſought the Clefts of Rocks or Mountains? we may accordingly conclude touching that *Hoſt*, which lies ſo often hid, and hath

Humbert. contra. Nicet. Tom. 4. Bibl. Patr. Part. 2. p. 247. C.

Eſaiah ii. 20.

L. 2. *vitæ Othm. C. 3. apud Sur. d. 16. Nov.*

hath ſo oft been buried in the Caverns of the Earth, that it can never be, ὁ Θεὸς ἐπὶ πάντων, or *God over all bleſſed for ever.*

§. XI.

5. The Prophet *Jeremy* declares that *Heathen Idols* were neither to be feared nor worſhipped, becauſe they were expoſed to the injuries of fire, *when fire falls upon the houſe of Gods of wood, their Prieſts will fly away but they themſelves ſhall be burnt aſunder like beams. I know the fire can convince thee,* ſaith St. *Clemens, and cure thy ſuperſtition; if thou wilt ceaſe from thy madneſs, the fire will bring thee to the light, for it hath burnt the Temple which was at* Epheſus *and* Rome, *&c. Where was the thunderer,* ſaith *Arnobius, when by the fire his Capitol, his worſhip, his wife, and daughter were conſumed? Where was the* Ægyptian *Serapis, when by a like misfortune he with his* Iſis *and all his myſteries were burnt to aſhes? They bluſh not,* ſaith Athanaſius, *to worſhip wood, and ſtones, as not conſidering that they do burn and trample under feet the like, and that a little before they were of common uſe. They worſhip,* ſaith Lactantius, *things that may be burnt, and what a madneſs is it to worſhip that on the account of which we fear the fire?* And yet tis certain that the *Roman Hoſt,* at leaſt as far as we are able to diſcern, may be conſumed or burnt by fire. Witneſs the Cuſtom of the antient *Chriſtians,* recorded by *Heſychius,* to burn all that remained after the celebration of the Euchariſt; witneſs the *Canons* extant in *Ivo* and *Burchardus*, touching the burning of the too ſtale and mucid Hoſt: Witneſs the ſad complaint of *Geraldinus* that in *Hiſpaniola* the very body of his God was in great danger to be fired by the wicked; witneſs the very

Baruch. vi. 55. Οἶδα πῦρ ἐλεγκτικὸν καὶ δαιμονίας ἰατρικόν. Clem. Πεογτ. p. 35.

Ubinam fulminator, &c. l. 6. p. 207.

Contra Gentes. p. 15. l. 2. c. 4. p. 154. *Vide Supra.*

Nunc videmus igni tradi quæcunque remanere contigerit inconſumpta.

Heſ. in Levit. viii. 32.

Ivo, l. 2. c. 22. 59.

Burch. l. 5. c. 12, 50.

Vide Supra.

[a] Canon

[a] *Si muſca vel aranea vel aliquidaliud ceciderit in Calicem --- poſt conſecrationem --- Sacerdos extrahat eam & lavet cum vino, finitâq; Miſſâ comburat, &c. Miſſal. de defect. in Miniſterio occur. Can. 5. Si per negligentiam aliquid de Sanguine Chriſti ceciderit, locus iſte quantum ſatis eſt radatur & abraſio comburatur.* ibid. Can. 12.

[a] Canon of the *Maſs*, which peremptorily decrees, that *if a fly doth fall into the Chalice, then* this God-drinking fly *muſt when the Sacrament is finiſhed, inſtantly be burnt*, ſo alſo muſt that Earth on which this blood at any time is ſpilt, and conſequently the God contained in the belly of the fly, or ſuckt in by the ſoft Earth muſt burn together with them. And will not therefore the ſame fire convince the *Romaniſt*, and cure his ſuperſtition too? May we not call upon him in the langûage of St. *Clemens* to forſake his madneſs, and to be guided by the light of this *Hoſt*-burning-fire? May we not ask, as doth *Arnobius*, where was your Lord and God, when fire ſeized, as it hath often done, not only his *Temples*, and his *Altars*, but his very body? May we not with *Lactantius* ſay, What madneſs is it for you *Romaniſts* to worſhip that on the account of which you fear the fire, as your own *Geraldinus* doth confeſs? Have we not reaſon to conclude with *Athanaſius* that you therefore do not bluſh to pay this Homage to the *Hoſt*, as not conſidering that you do burn the like, or think as did your *Paludanus*, that even to burn a mouldy *Hoſt*, if it were truly God, muſt be *immane ſacrilegium* a very horid Sacrilege? Can we imagin that thoſe *Chriſtians*, who always deemed it a cruelty to burn the Carcaſs of the meaneſt Chriſtian, ſhould burn the ſacred body of that God they worſhipped? Or would *Remigius* have counſelled *Clodovæus*, when he came to receive *Chriſtian Baptiſm*, to ſhew his deteſtation of thoſe Idols which he formerly revered *by burning what he had adored*, if, even *Chriſtians* did believe that what they burned was to be worſhipped as their God? To prove that *Calviniſts* do offer the moſt

Hoſtias conſecratas quamvis mucidas comburere immane ſacrilegium. Pal. 4. d. 9. q. I. art. 3. *Vide Tertul. de* An. C. 51. *Incende quod adoraſti. Greg. Turon.* L. 2. C. 31. p. 287.

moſt vile affronts to Holy *Saints* and *Martyrs*, *Bellarmin* tells us, that *they have burnt their bodies and their Reliques and caſt their aſhes into Rivers.* And muſt not then the antient *Chriſtians* offer more vile contempt to their dear *Lord*, if they believed that Sacrament which they ſo cuſtomarily did burn, to be that ſacred body which with the Deity, to which it was united, they worſhipped as God?

Bellarm. *de Reliq. Sanctorum.* L. 2. C. 1. To. 1. Controv. 7.

§. XII.

6. Again the Prophet *Jeremy* derides the *Heathen Idols*, becauſe they were expoſed to ruſt and moth, from which they cannot ſave themſelves, ſaith he, though they be covered with Purple Garments. *Do you not ſee*, ſaith Arnobius, *that even theſe Images, whoſe feet and knees you praying touch, decay by reaſon of thoſe drops of rain that fall upon them? that they diſſolve by rottenneſs, and that they by the injuries of time do loſe their form and are eaten out by ruſt? Now theſe things*, ſaith he, *which are plain before you, ought to inſtruct and to admoniſh you, that you do nothing, and pay your homage to vain things.* And yet tis certain that the *Romiſh God* doth lie expoſed to the like or greater injuries. It is in danger of being waſhed away by inundations, witneſs the Canon of the *Maſs* which doth provide, that in that caſe the *Maſs-Prieſt ſhould make haſt to eat him up.* Tis ſubject to the injuries of the wind, witneſs that Canon of the *Maſs*, which ſaith, that *if the Conſecrated Hoſt be blown away and diſappear, the Maſs-Prieſt ſhall prepare another.* Tis lyable to be congealed by the cold air, witneſs that *Canon* which provides that in this caſe *it ſhall be thawed by being put into warm water, or wrapped in warm cloaths.* It may be ſubject to corruption, witneſs that *Canon* which doth charge the Prieſt, *if*

Bar. vi. 12.

L. 6. p. 262.

Si timetur incurſus hoſtium vel alluvionis, &c.

Si Hoſtia conſecrata vento diſpareat.

Si in Hyeme Sanguis congeletur in chalice, &c.

Si Celebrans post consecrationem adverterit Hostiam esse corruptam, &c. de defect. Miss.

if after Consecration he perceive the Host to be corrupted, to eat it up, or to preserve it reverently, or give it to be eaten by some other person. Lastly the Host is lyable unto such change of qualities as will convert it into poison, or render it destructive to the lives of men. Witness the [a] *Emperor*, the [b] *Popes*, and the [c] *Archbishop*, which have been poysoned by the *Chalice*, and witness also the provisions that are made in such a case by several *Canons* in the *Mass*, about the ordering of such poysoned wine. Now ought not these things, which are plain before them, to admonish and instruct the *Romanist*, that to adore this Host as *God*, is to imploy his service on that which he doth vainly call a *Deity*; for can it be supposed, without horror, that Christs immortal body should be corrupted, or that his precious blood be congealed by frost, or so invenomedas to destroy the lives of men.

[a] *Henry* VII. *Albert. de Euch.* l. 1. c. 19. p. 124.

[b] *Victor* 2, 3. *idem* ibid.

[c] *Hen. Eboracensis. Matth. Paris. in Stephano.*

Si aliquid venenosum ceciderit in calicem. ib:

Si aliquid venenatum contigerit Hostiam, &c.

§. XIII.

7. The *Scriptures* and the *Fathers* do more especially deride the *Heathen Idols*, because they seemed to be contemned by the very brutes; *Their Hearts*, saith *Jeremy*, *are gnawed upon by things creeping out of the Earth, and when they eat them and their Cloaths, they feel it not. Upon their bodies and heads sit Bats, Swallows, and Birds, and the Cats also, by this you may know that they are no Gods, therefore fear them not. You may learn*, saith Clemens Alexandrinus. *from the very birds that their Images are void of sense; for Swallows and other Birds cast forth their dung upon them, bearing no reverence towards either their* Jupiter *or Æsculapius, their* Minerva, *or* Serapis. *Blush at the last*, saith Arnobius, *and learn the ways of reason from these mute creatures, and let them teach you there is no Divinity*

Bar. vi. 20, 21.

Πρεπ. p. 29.

Erubescite vel sero atque ab animantibus mutis vias rationis accipite, &c. Arnob. l. 6. p. 202.

Divinity in theſe Images, which they do not avoid, nor fear to dung upon, following the Laws and inſtinct of their nature; this is another ſenſible demonſtration from which he tells them *they may learn the vanity of all that ſervice which they pay unto them. How many things do theſe mute creatures* (ſaith Minutius) *judg touching your Gods?* p. 26. *The Mice, the Swallows, and the Kites perceive they have no ſenſe, they gnaw them, they tread, they ſit upon them, and if you do not drive them thence, will neſt within the very mouths of your ſuppoſed Deities. Are thieves ſo fooliſh as to fear Priapus,* ſaith Lactantius, *when even the birds do ſit and dung upon him? Better it were,* ſaith Auſtin, *to worſhip Mice and Serpents, and ſuch like Creatures; for they after a ſort do judg of Heathen Idols, in which becauſe they ſee no life, they do not fear the human ſhape.* Now that theſe things may happen to the *Romiſh Hoſt* is evident from their own Canons, which ſpeak thus, *If any Conſecrated Hoſt be ſnatched up by ſome beaſt, and cannot afterwards be found, another ſhall be Conſecrated. If a Fly or ſuch like Creature fall into the Chalice, he ſhall be taken out and burnt, or ſwallowed by the Prieſt*; and reaſon good, becauſe whole *Chriſt*, being contained in every particle of the blood, the little inſect, if he drink any thing, muſt have him wholly in his Guts; Twas this occaſioned the Converſion of Mr. *Gage* a *Romiſh Prieſt, viz.* his ſeeing a bold Mouſe come from behind the *Altar*, and ſnatch a way his *Wafer-God*, and eat half of him up before he could be reſcued from his teeth. This alſo is evident from reaſon, for will not any Mouſe or Rat, Dog or Cat, following the laws or inſtinct of their nature, gnaw, eat, devour, the *Roman Hoſt*, provided

L. 2. p. 153. *In* Pſ. 113. *Con.* 2.

Si Hoſtia conſecrata diſparet ab aliquo animali accepta. Miſſal. de defect. Miſſ. C. 3. S. 7. Ibid. C. 10. S. 5. *vide ſupra.*

Gages New Survey of the *weſt-Indies.* p. 447.

vided that the *Maſs-Prieſt* do not drive them from it? And if it be ſo horrid to conceive, according to St. *Auſtin* and *Arnobius*, that birds ſhould neſt even in the mouth of God, muſt it not be more horrid to conceive that God ſhould be received, and drawn into the mouth and ſtomach of a beaſt? Would any of them ſcruple think you, if they had occaſion and convenience to dung upon the *Hoſt* or in the *Chalice*? And is it not then evident according to St. *Clemens*, that theſe beaſts do bear no reverence toward the *Roman God*? Do they not perceive according to *Minutius*, and St. *Auſtin*, that it hath no ſenſe? May we not wonder with St. *Clemens*, that *Romaniſts* have not yet learned from theſe birds their *Hoſt* is an inſenſate being? May not this ſenſible demonſtration teach them, according to *Arnobius*, that there is no Divinity in any *Hoſt*, and that their worſhip of it is a vain and fruitleſs ſervice? Once was the time when *Ægypt* was made aſhamed of their chief God, when they ſaw Mice creeping out of his belly; what would they have ſaid, if they had ſeen their God creeping down, as the *Maſs-God* doth into the belly of thoſe Mice or Flys.

Theodoret Hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. cap. 22.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The Contents.

8. *The Scriptures and Fathers deride the Heathen Deities, and ſay that we may know they are no Gods, becauſe they have no uſe of their outward ſenſes.* §. I. 9. *Becauſe they are made Gods by Conſecration, and by the will of the Artificer, part of that matter which is Conſecrated into a God, being expoſed to common uſes.* §. II. 10. *Becauſe they were impriſoned in their Images, or ſhut up in obſcure habitations.* §. III. 11. *Becauſe they lighted Candles to them.* §. IV. 12. *Becauſe they clothed their Gods in coſtly Raiments.* §. V. 13. *Becauſe they might be metamorphoſed.* §. VI. *All this may truly be affirmed of the* Roman *Hoſt, from* §. I. *to* §. VI. *The* Roman *God being eaten may be vomited up again, and voided at the draught.* §. VII. *An expoſtulation with the Worſhippers of the Hoſt in the words of* Arnobius. §. VIII. *All that the Fathers ſay againſt the Heathen Gods, is in the perſon of a Heathen retorted on the Adorers of the Hoſt.* §. IX. *Corollaries from what hath been already proved.* 1. *That the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, or of the Adoration of the Hoſt as God, was not acknowledged by the Antient Fathers.* §. X. *A confirmation of this Corollary from three Conſiderations.* 1. *That the Heathens could not be ignorant of this ſuppoſed Article of Chriſtian Faith, or of this practice of the Church, provided that they Antiently believed and practiſed as doth the preſent*

Church of Rome. §. XI. 2. *That the Jews and Heathens left nothing unobjected which could with any ſhew of reaſon be offered from any other Doctrine or Practice of Chriſtianity againſt the Deity and Worſhip of our Lord, and yet ſay nothing againſt this Doctrine, or this Practice.* §. XII. 3. *That the Fathers of the Church do largely anſwer all other ſcruples of Hereticks and Heathens which made them to ſuſpect the Deity of Chriſt, but never ſay one word of this.* §. XIII. *This never was objected by Heretick or Heathen as an abſurdity till the Eleventh or Twelfth Century.* ibid. 2. *Corol. That the Hoſt cannot be truly God, and conſequently that Church, by which it is Worſhipped as God, is guilty of Idolatry.* §. XIV. *The proof of this Corollary is a ſufficient vindication of the Church of* England *in the point of Schiſm, and a ſufficient confutation of the whole Maſs of the* Roman *errors.*

§. I.

8. THE *Pſalmiſt* ſmartly doth deride the the *Heathen Gods*, becauſe they have no uſe of any of their outward ſenſes, *They have mouths*, ſaith he, *but they* Pſal. cxv. 5, 6, 7. *ſpeak not, eyes have they, but they ſee not, they have ears but they hear not, noſes have they, but they ſmell not, they have hands but handle not, feet have they* Ch. xv. 14, 15. *but they walk not.* The worſhippers of *Idols*, ſaith the Book of Wiſdom, are moſt fooliſh, and are more miſerable, than very Babes, *for they counted all the Idols of the Heathen to be Gods, which neither have the uſe of eyes to ſee, nor noſes to draw breath, nor ears to hear, nor fingers of hands to handle; and as for their feet they are ſlow to go.* Chap. x. 5. *They are upright as a Palm-Tree but ſpeak not,* Baruch. vi. 7. ſaith the Prophet *Jeremy. As for their tongue*

it

it is poliſhed by the workman, yet are they but falſe and cannot ſpeak. They are *dumb Idols*, ſaith the Prophet Habakkuk, *and have no breath at all in the midſt of them. Wo* therefore *unto him that ſaith to the dumb ſtone ariſe, it ſhall teach. Doſt thou not ſee*, ſaith *Clemens*, *that what thou worſhippeſt cannot ſee or hear? Their minds have throughly drunk of the juyce of folly*, ſaith Lactantius, of the adorers of the Heathen *Idols*; *for having ſenſe themſelves, they worſhip things which have no ſenſe, which neither did perceive when they were made, nor do they know when they are worſhipped; for they receive no uſe of any of their ſenſes from their Conſecration; they have indeed a mouth but ſuch a one as wants the uſe of teeth. Who would commiſerate them*, ſaith Athanaſius, *who ſeeing, worſhip thoſe things which ſee not; who hearing, pray to that which heareth not; who being endowed with life, ſalute that as a God which doth not move at all? They have their ſenſes and yet they have them not, for they have no uſe of them, giving no Character*, no demonſtration *of their divinity thereby.* St. *Auſtin* thought he had ſufficiently diſgraced the *Heathen* Deities by ſaying that *the Prieſt did ſcare the ſeeing beaſt from the blind God, the hearing beaſt from the deaf God, the walking beaſt from him that could not move, and that he worſhips him as a powerful God, who hath not power to move himſelf.* The *Pſalmiſt*, ſaith *Theodoret*, doth *many ways demonſtrate the weakneſs of the Heathen Gods, ſaying that they have mouths and ſpeak not, their Images have* ſenſuum domicilia, *but are deprived of their operations, and therefore they are more vile than the leaſt of living Creatures, than even Gnats and Flys, which have the uſe of all their ſenſes; and therefore they*

Hab. ii. 18, 19.

Nonne vides quod quem adoras non videt. *Recogn.* L. 5. C. 16.

Nec enim ſenſum Conſecratione ſumpſerunt. Lact. L. 2. C. 2, 4.

Contra Gent. p. 15.

Et illum non ſe moventem quaſi potentem colit, à quo meliorem deterruit. Auguſt. in Pſ. cxiii. Conc. 2.

In Pſal. cxv.

that make, and they that worſhip them, are like to them, becauſe they being men indued with reaſon, and falling into ſuch temerity, tis juſt that they ſhould be deprived of their ſenſes, as are the Idols which they worſhip. They worſhip their Gods *in the form of a dead body*, ſaith Hilary, *whoſe mouth is dumb, eyes dull, ears deaf, noſes empty, hands feeble, feet ſtiff, and their whole body is immoveable*, Now all theſe things which equal truth, may be affirmed of the *Hoſt*; and it is ſubject as much to all theſe ſcoffs as any of the *Heathen Idols*; for do not *Romaniſts* aſſert, and doth not their experience oblige them to confeſs, that *Chriſt* is in the *Euchariſt mortuo modo*, in the condition of a man wholly dead, void of all ſenſe and motion, not being able to move one finger in his own defence? May we not therefore ſay of them in the words of *Hilary*, *That they worſhip their God in formâ corporis mortui.* Do they not ſometimes chaſe the ſeeing beaſt from their blind God, the hearing beaſt from their deaf God, the walking beaſt from him that cannot move? And notwithſtanding they adore the Hoſt which cannot move, as an *Almighty God.* Muſt they not therefore have ſufficient ground to ſee, that what they worſhip cannot ſee? muſt they not know that it receives no uſe of any of its ſenſes by vertue of their Conſecration? and that it gives no *Character* or demonſtration of its divinity by any of them? Have we not then ſufficient reaſon to conclude, as do the *Fathers* on the like account, and the inſpired *Prophets*, that what the *Romaniſt* doth worſhip as a God, is a *dumb Idol*? and that it is not to be feared, that they who worſhip it are drunken with the juyce of folly; they are more miſerable and fooliſh than the very babes? Or in the language of the Pſalmiſt and

In forma corporis mortui adorant. In Pſal. cxxxiv.

Becan. de Sacr. in Specie. c. 19. qu. 5.

of

of *Theodoret*, *Hilary* and *Cyril*, that they are, and deserve to be made like unto their *Host*, and be as senseless as it is. I remember *Clemens* in his Recognitions endeavours to confound and shame the Idol-Worshippers by this inquiry, *Would any of you be like unto these Gods you worship? Would you so see as they see? So hear as they hear? And have no other use of any of your senses than they have? This sure would be a curse and a reproach unto you.* [a] *What kind of Gods must they be then, whom to be like would be an execration to their Worshippers, and a reproach?* And may we not with great advantage ask the *Romanist*, would you be like your *Host?* would you so see as that sees, and have no other use of any of your senses than that hath? would you be swallowed down or eaten up by Flys, and Rats, and Mice, as that hath been? would you descend into the stomach, would you be buried, and burnt as he hath often been? If this be truly the condition of our blessed *Lord*, St. *Peter* had more cause to say when Christ instituted the Sacrament, than when he was about to suffer on the Cross, *Master spare thy self.*

[a] *Quales ergo Dii habendi sunt isti, quos imitari execrabile sit cultoribus suis? quorum similitudinem habere contumelia est?* *Recog.* L. 5. C. 15. p. 465.

9. The *Prophet Esa* speaks it to the shame of *Heathens*, that when the *Carpenter* had hewn down a Tree, *with part thereof he makes a fire, with part he baketh bread, and with the residue he makes a God, he falleth down, he worshippeth, he prayeth to it.* Hence he concludes, *that God had shut their eyes that they could not see, and their hearts that they could not understand. The Potter*, saith the Author of the Book of *Wisdom*, *of the same Clay makes both the Vessels which serve for clean and unclean uses, and employing his labor lewdly, he maketh a vain God*

§. II. Es. xliv. 16. Wisd. xv. 7, 8.

Materias sororis esse instrumentorum communionem quasi fatum consecratione mutantes. Apol. c. 12.

of the same Clay. *As far as I am able to discern, their Idols*, saith Tertullian, *are of like matter with our common Vessels and only become Gods by Consecration.* Now do not all these scoffs return upon the *Host* with equal evidence? Is it not made of a like matter with our common bread, and only doth become a God by Consecration? May not one lump of Meal (to give an instance parallel to that of wood and clay,) be used partly to wrap up the *Apothecaries* Pills, and partly to make those Wafers which the *Priest* doth Consecrate into a God? And then, as saith the Book of *Wisdom* in derision of the *Heathen Idols*, *that is taken for a God which a little before was not honoured as a man*; and have we not then equal reason to conclude touching the *Romanists*, that God hath shut their eyes that they cannot see, and their hearts that they cannot understand?

Ch. xiv. 20.

P. 26.

Perhaps the stone, the wood, the brass, the silver, saith Minucius, *is not yet God, when therefore is this God produced? 'Tis melted, made, 'tis carved, and it is yet no God, 'tis polished, framed and set up, but no God yet; but now behold, it is adorned, consecrated, prayed unto, and then it is a God, when men will have him so to be and dedicate him to that use*; And may not all this be returned upon the *Host*? Might not the *Pagan* say, You Christians grind and sift, and bake your wheat and 'tis but yet a *Wafer*, you set it on the Altar, you elevate and cross it, but 'tis yet no God; at last you speak five words, with an intention to Consecrate this bread into a God, and the thing is done, *tunc Deus est cum homo illum voluit & dedicavit. Is it not plain*, saith Clemens, *that the Idol is metal framed according to the will of the Artificer, how then can any divinity be con-*

Recogn. l. 4. c. 20. p. 458.

ceived

ceived in that which, if the Artificer had not been willing, had not been at all; and is it not more plain by the ſame argument that there is no Divinity in the Wafer, which if the Prieſt did not intend, and therefore was not willing to Conſecrate, would not be God at all, and which if the Baker would not have made, would not have been at all?

St. *Auſtin*, in his Book of the *City of God*, L. 8. C. 23. diſcourſeth largely to this purpoſe, where firſt he introduceth *Hermes* aſſerting *that ſome Gods, are made by men*; *this*, ſaith he, *at firſt hearing one would conceive he ſpake concerning Images, but theſe by* Hermes *are only ſtiled the bodies of the Gods, but to theſe bodies, this* Hermes *ſaith, men by their art do couple ſome inviſible ſpirits, and this*, ſaith he, *is making Gods, this is that great and wonderful power man hath received, and as God is the maker of the heavenly Gods, ſo man is the maker of thoſe Gods which dwell in Temples near to men*, which in the language of the Schools is only this, God makes them by a new *Creation*, man by *adduction*, or by procuring their preſence in the Image by virtue of their Conſecration. Now *theſe things*, ſaith *St.* Auſtin, *are vain, deceitful, pernicious, and ſacrilegious, and it was the deſign of Chriſtian Faith to free men from theſe Gods which man doth make*; to this effect he cites the paſſage of the Prophet *Jeremy*, *if a man makes Gods behold they are no Gods*; now are not *Roman Doctors* in this ſenſe the makers of that God they worſhip? do they not by the art of Conſecration couple the *Divinity* of *Chriſt* unto his body? Do they not bring him down unto their Temples? And make him there to dwell with men? Whom, as the Scripture tells us, *the Heavens muſt contain*

until the day of Judgment? Doth not their Conſecration make him dwell, as ſaith the *Heathen* in *Arnobius, under the ſigns?* Wherefore their God, according to St. *Auſtin* muſt be no God. Or ſuch a God as *Chriſtianity* deſigned to free us from, and all their ſpecious pretences touching this matter muſt be vain, pernicious, and ſacrilegious.

§. III. 10. The *Fathers* do deſpiſe and vilifie the *Heathen Deities*, becauſe they were ſhut up, and as it were impriſoned in their *Images*. *We do deſervedly account them mad*, ſaith Athanaſius; *who do not bluſh to call on them as Lords of Heaven and Earth, whom they ſhut up in little houſes, hence*, ſaith he, *any man may learn their Atheiſm. Is it not the extremity of madneſs*, ſaith *St.* Chryſoſtom, *to conceive, they do not ſay, and do things filthy, when they endeavour to bring their Gods into the Images of wood and ſtone, and there to ſhut them up as in a Priſon?* The very *Cyclops* in *Euripides* when he was told that Wine was *Bacchus*, ſtands amazed and preſently declares it an indecent thing *that God ſhould dwell in bottles or in skins*, Theſe things ſeemed prodigies to him. Now we all know the *Papiſts* God is kept impriſoned in his *box* or *Tabernacle*, that he is put into a *bag*, or *skin* when the *Prieſt* carries him about his neck, that he may in the ſpecies of Wine, be put into a *bottle*, and was ſo by the *antient Chriſtians*, and that he dwelleth in his little *Box* or *Tabernacle*, (as they are pleaſed to call the *Box* in which they place him) *Arnobius* is very copious on this ſubject, *Their Gods*, ſaith he, *can dwell in clay, and playſter, and that ſuch vile things may become more glorious, they ſuffer themſelves to be ſhut up, and lie concealed in the reſtraint of an obſcure habitation. This therefore*, ſaith he, *I deſire to know, whether*

Οὓς ἐν μικροῖς οἰκίσκοις κατακλείειν. Contr. Gent. p. 24.

Πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἐσμὲν τῆς παραπλησίας, &c. Tom. 5. p. 517. Lin. 28.

Θεὸς ἐν δέρμασι, Θεὸς ἐν ἀσκῷ; Eurip. in Cycl. v. 528, 530.

In gypſo ergo manſitant atq; in teſtulis Dii veſtri, l. 6. p. 203.

whether they go unwillingly into theſe manſions, and forced into them by their dedication? or whether they do it willingly? If they do this unwillingly, what can conſtrain their Divine Majeſty? If willingly, what is it that makes them to prefer theſe ſhells before the heavenly manſions, ſince by ſo doing they loſe the power of their Divinity? Are they free to quit thoſe Manſions, when they pleaſe, or are they neceſſitated to ſtay there always? If they have power to leave them when they pleaſe, the ſigns may ceaſe then to be Gods, and ſo it will be doubtful when they are to be worſhipped, and when not. But if they are neceſſitated there to abide, what is more miſerable and more unhappy than they are? Beſides ſometimes their Images are very little, and ſometimes very great, the Gods muſt therefore in the little ones contract, but in the great ones extend themſelves, when they ſit, ſtand, or run, the Gods muſt ſit, ſtand, run, and muſt accommodate themſelves to all the poſtures of the Image where they dwell. Again the gods, ſay you, dwell in Images, do they dwell every one wholly in each, or partly in one, and partly in another Image, ſo as to be divided amongſt all their Images? One God cannot be wholly in them all at once, put caſe in many thouſand Images of Vulcan, *becauſe what is but one, and ſingular by nature, cannot be multiplied into many, and yet be one, or yet preſerve its own ſimplicity; for if you ſay the ſame being is in them all, all reaſon and integrity muſt periſh from the truth, if that be granted, that one can at one time abide in them all, for then each God muſt be affirmed ſo to divide his very ſelf, as that he ſhall be both himſelf, and be another; which becauſe nature doth reject, refuſe, and ſpurn at, either we muſt confeſs there are innumerable* Vulcans, *or that he is in none of all theſe Images, becauſe he by his nature is forbidden*

Invitinè hoc faciunt? ibid.

Intelligere debemus in ſigillioliis parvulis contrahere ſe Deos. p. 204.

forbidden to be divided amongſt them all. Now all theſe things ſo palpably conclude againſt the *Roman Hoſt*, that it is almoſt needleſs to make out the parallel. Doth not that *God* permit himſelf to be ſhut up, and lie concealed in an obſcure habitation? If he doth this unwillingly, is there not ſome reſtraint upon him? If willingly, what makes him to prefer theſe ſigns before the Heavenly Manſions? Is he compelled to abide under theſe ſigns until the ſpecies be corrupted? If ſo, what is more miſerable, or more unhappy than this God, who muſt abide under theſe ſpecies, even when they are devoured by the vileſt vermin, or mixt with the moſt loathſom vomit. But if he may depart at pleaſure, it will be always doubtful when this reſerved *Hoſt* is to be worſhipped, and when not. Moreover when a great Loaf is Conſecrated, according to the antient Cuſtom of the *Church*, he muſt extend, and when a little *Wafer*, muſt contract his body. He muſt accommodate himſelf to all the poſtures of the *Wafer*, move when it moves, ſtand ſtill when it doth ſo, he muſt dwell wholly in every Conſecrated *Wafer* (*i.e.*) in many thouſand *Wafers* at a time, (which ſaith *Arnobius*, cannot be, it being inconſiſtent with his unity) or ſo divide his ſelf from his own very ſelf, as that he ſhall be both himſelf, and another; which nature doth reject, refuſe and ſpurn at.

§. IV.

Baruch vi. 19. *Accendunt candelas velut in tenebris agenti. Jam ſe cum his inanibus officiis, ſtultiſſimos eſſe cognoſcant* &c. Lact. l. 6. p. 544, 545, 547.

11. The Prophet *Jeremy* laughs at the *Heathen* Cuſtom of *lighting Candles to their Gods*: *They light them candles*, ſaith he, *more than for themſelves, of which they cannot ſee one. They light Candles to God as if he was in the dark*, ſaith Lactantius, *now can he be eſteem'd* compos mentis *who offers for a gift Candles, or wax lights to him*

who

who is the Author of light. Their Gods, indeed because they are but Earthy, may want lights lest they should be in darkness, whose worshippers because they understand not what is Heavenly, bring their Religion down unto the earth; and by these rites, more than by any other thing may their Gods be proved to be dead, because their rites are wholly earthy. As for our God who could create the Sun and Stars to be a light to men, he wants no earthly lights. When we assemble together, or publickly rejoyce, saith Nazianzen, *let not our senses shine with sensible light, for this is the Heathen Custom at their new Moons: but let not us honor God with such things, which it becomes us not to use, but with purity of soul, with the brightness of our minds, with lights that lighten the whole body of the Church, I mean with divine Theorems and Notions set upon a holy Candlestick and giving light to the whole world.* And yet we know the Church of *Rome* commands that *at the least one lamp shall burn before the Host continually, if not more*; that when the *Host* is carried to the sick, *there shall still be a light to go before it*, and that the *Parishoners or the Fraternity shall be called to attend upon the Sacrament with wax lights and torches.* On *Corpus Christi* day, they are all, that run before it, *to carry wax lights in their hand.* Now of these lighted Candles, it truly may be said that the *Host* sees not one, which was the infamy the *Prophet* cast upon the *Heathen Idols*: We may according to *Lactantius* conclude the *Romanists* have lost their wits who do thus serve their God, that they understand not what is *Heavenly*, that they worship *a dead thing*: we may say unto our brethren as *Nazianzen* doth unto his fellow *Christians*, *Let us not honor God with such things, for it becomes*

Num igitur mentis suæ compos putandus est qui datori luminis candelarum manus offert pro mane? p. 546.

Ἡμεῖς μὴ τούτοις τὸν Θεὸν γεραίρωμεν οἷς οὐκ ἄξιον. Στηλιτ. 2. p. 106. Ed. Eton.

Lampades coram eo plures vel saltem una die noctuque perpetuo colluceat. Ritual. p. 64. *Semper lumine præcedente.* ibid. p. 71. *Cum cereis seu intortitiis comitentur.* ibid.

becomes not us to use them. And Lastly with the *Prophet* we may laugh both at their *Host*, and them who light unto it Candles more than for themselves, of which it cannot see one.

§. V. 12. The Prophet *Jeremy* laughs at the *Heathen Priests* because they cloath their Gods with costly rayment. *You shall know them to be no Gods*, saith he, *by the bright Purple that rotteth upon them. They deck them with Silver and Gold*, saith the same *Prophet. They provide for them hoods and pretious cloathing*, saith Lactantius, *who have no use of any covering, and vainly do adorn them with Gold and Jewels, and bring unto them frankincense and sweet odours.* Whereas unto this *Roman God* belongs a *Tabernacle* as richly decked with Gold and Silver as can well be, a *white veil*, and two *Clerks* going before him. *Cum thuribulis effumantibus*, he therefore is accoutred much like a *Heathen God:* and if it were ridiculous to deck, to cloath, to incense them, so it must be equally ridiculous to do these things unto the *Host*.

Baruch vi. 72.
Jer. x. 4.
L. 2. C. 4.
Rituale Rom. p. 64.

§. VI. 13. Moreover your Gods, saith *Tatian* to the *Heathens*, are *Metamorphosed*, Rhea *into a Tree*, Jupiter *into a Dragon. They are things*, saith Justin, *which have not the form or likeness of a God.* And is not also that supposed *Christ* whcih *Roman Catholicks* do worship *Metamorphosed* into a *Wafer*, and *a drop of blood* which also hath no form or likeness of a God?

Μετα μορφῶντω καὶ παρὰ ὑμῖν οἱ Θεοὶ, &c. p. 149.
Καὶ Θεὸν μορφὴν μὴ ἔχοντα. Apol. 2. 57.

§. VII. To conclude, it is affirmed by the *Church of Rome*, that their God being eaten, may *by the squeamish stomach be cast up again*, witness that Canon *Si sacerdos evomat Eucharistiam.* Which doth exhort the *Priest* when he doth vomit up *the Sacrament to wipe it, and try once more to eat it.*

De defect. in minist. occur. Reg. 14.

They

They alſo intimate that the Communicant may ſpit him out upon the ground, witneſs the caution in their *Ritual*, that *after the reception of the Euchariſt, they do not for a ſeaſon ſpit*, ne Sacramenti ſpecies de ore decidant. And Laſtly to complete their *blaſphemy*, they do acknowledg that in diſeaſes which take away digeſtion *their God comes whole out of the draught*: So it hath hapned, ſaith *Paludanus*, ſo it muſt happen in this caſe, ſaith *Soto, for ſhame ſhould not conſtrain us to deny the truth.* Now to be ſpit out of the mouth, or caſt out of the ſtomach, or to be ejected at the draught are the peculiar excellencies of this *Maſs-God*, which all the follies of the *Heathens* cannot parallel. 'Pious and learned *Origen* demon-'ſtrates againſt *Celſus*, the uncleanneſs of that 'ſpirit, which inſpired Pagan Prophets by the un-'clean parts he entered: and upon the ſame 'ground one may gueſs at the holineſs attributed 'to this God of bread, by the ſame parts he goes 'out of. I cannot write to this purpoſe, what a 'civil man could not read, or a pious one but 'think of, and therefore forbear to dilate on it. 'Learned men know what Rabbins ſay about the 'worſhipping of *Baal Peor*. This new Idol is 'twice as bad: for certainly, neither antient nor 'modern Expoſitors thought hitherto, that Holy 'Scripture ſhould call a Deity, *Boſheth* and *Gillu-'lim*, that is a God of ſhame and dung, upon ſuch 'a literal and proper account. D. *Brevints* depth 'of the *Romiſh Maſs*. p. 78. Chap. 8.

Ne ſumpto Sacramento ſtatim expuant. p. 64. *Propter quod non danda eſt Euchariſtia habenti talem fluxum quod integrum emittit hoc quod ſumit. In* 4. Sent. Diſt. 9. q. 1. Art. 2. *Si ob aliquem morbum ſpecies diſcenderent, conſequenter & ipſum Corpus deſcenderet, & emitteretur, pudor enim non debet eſſe in causâ negandi veritatem. In* Sent. 4. Diſt. 12. q. 1. Art. 3.

§. VI I.

Here then we have juſt reaſon to enquire with *Arnobius, Whether it were not better much to blaſpheme, revile, and ſpeak reproachfully of Chriſt, than with pretence of piety to entertain ſuch baſe unworthy thoughts, ſuch monſtrous conceptions of him?* May we

L. 3. p. 106. *Relius multò eſt deos eſſe non credere quam eſſe illos tales.* Id. l. 4. p. 151.

Hoccine audiri sub mundi hoc axe, &c. l. 5. p. 173. *Estne aliquod sacrilegium hoc majus?* Ibid.

not exclaim with him. *What, shall such things as these be read, or heard under the Cope of Heaven, and shall they who assert, and do them, be esteemed Saints, and pious men, the guides and keepers of Religion? Is there any Sacriledg greater than this, or is there any Nation under Heaven which holds such impious opinions as these be, and doth betray her belief of them in her Sacred Mysteries?* At least, I hope we may have leave to speak to *Roman Catholicks* as did this *Father* to the *Heathens*, humbly desiring to know, if they do verily esteem their *Wafers* to be Gods, *How they can understand them so to be? for we, unless they will deprive us even of common sense, must say, we are not able to perceive that they have any Deity residing in them, or that they bear any similitude to our most Glorious Jesus. Why is it then that you compel us*, not only by your Excommunication, but by Fire and Fagot, *to the worship of such Gods? What say you, O you Romans, is this the sacred Worship which you by flames, exiles* and *slaughters*, and which is more than all, by inquisitions *would compel us to? Are these the Gods which you would introduce into this Nation, and inflict upon us, to which you would neither wish your selves nor any of your kindred to be like? Do you not blush to object unto us our neglect to worship things so infamous, that it is better to believe that there are no Gods, than to imagine they are such as you do represent them?* And yet is our concernment less for what we suffer, than for what our excellent Religion suffers by this *Romish Worship*. We should less value the reproach of *Schismatick* and *Heretick* you cast upon us; did not your Doctrine cast reproach upon our *Dearest Lord*, the offence you give to us were more supportable; did not you also give offence both to the *Jew* and *Gentile* by your

Inscitiam nostram ut doceatis oramus, quâ viâ intelligi possunt dii esse, nos enim nihil horum sentimus habere vim Numinis. l. 4. p. 127. *Ad hæccine nos sacra*, &c. l. 5. p. 177 *Hoscine nobis deos importatis, infligitis quorum similes nec vos esse nec alium velitis quenquam.* Ibid.

your *Wafer Worſhip*; did you not harden them in infidelity; did you not by it miniſter juſt matter of excuſe for almoſt all the follies of the *Heathen Worſhip*, and furniſh them with a reply to thoſe moſt excellent *Apologies* the *Fathers* made for our Religion, and thoſe convincing demonſtrations which they brought againſt that ſuperſtition and *Idolatry* which then obtained. For to diſcourſe a little in the perſon of an *Heathen*, and to retort upon the *Chriſtians* the Arguments of theſe renowned *Fathers*.

§. IX.

Why ſhould it be eſteemed a thing ſo horrid, that our *Saturn* ſhould attempt *to eat his Son*, or that our *Jupiter* ſhould banquet with the *Æthiopians* on human fleſh; if *Chriſtians* think it ſacred to eat and feaſt upon the Son of God? The *Thyeſtæan* Supper is even by our ſelves eſteemed ſo foul an action that the *Sun could not behold it*, and muſt it be the choiſeſt part of *Chriſtian Worſhip* to feed upon human fleſh? Is it ſo prodigious in us *to ſacrifice our Sons and Daughters* to *Saturn*, *Moloch*, or to other *Demons*, and is it not prodigious in you *Chriſtians to ſacrifice the Son of God?* Are we reproachful to our *Jupiter* by Sacrificing to him men, and is it not more infamous in you to Sacrifice *God Man* to your *Jehovah?* Do we pollute our *Temples* with ſuch *Sacrifices*, and are yours hallowed with the like? Do you conclude it barbarous to be initiated into the ſervice of *Bellona*, *by eating*, ſaith *Tertullian*, *by drinking humane blood*, ſay others; when you your ſelves are conſecrated unto the ſervice of *Jehovah*, by drinking of the blood of *Jeſus?* or is it ſo portentous to ſacrifice to *Jupiter*, with human blood, and yet ſo pious to ſacrifice to your *Jehovah* with the blood of God? Is it ſo monſtrouſly abſurd for us to think that

Τέκνοφαγεῖν ἐλέσθαι. Juſtin. cohort. p. 38. Athan. contra gentes p. 12. Clem. Πρότρεπτ. p. 23. *Saturno infantes immolabantur.* Minut. p. 34.

Sanguinis pabulo. Apol. c. 9. *Cruoris hauſtu.* Minut. p. 34. *Jupiter homicidio colitur.* Minut. 16.

that when we carry *an old Shield*, our God is carry'd upon our ſhoulders, and muſt it not be equally abſurd, for you to think that Wafer which you carry in your hands, or on your ſhoulders, ſhould be your *Jehovah?* Do you laugh at *Æſculapius* when he appeared like a *Serpent, becauſe he flew not in the Air, nor rode upon the Clouds, but only crept upon the earth*, and ſeemed *to want a Boat to waft him over, and to preſerve him from the Sea*; when your new *Æſculapius* can neither fly, nor wag, without the help of a *Maſs-Prieſt*, nor paſs the Seas without the like aſſiſtance? Do you ask what a ridiculous thing it is to hear that *Jupiter* was ſo incenſed at the death of his Son [c] *Sarpedon*, and yet *though he was willing, was not able to preſerve him from the attempts of other Gods*; and is it leſs ridiculous to conſider that your God is neither able, nor ſo much as willing to preſerve himſelf from the attempts of man or beaſt? Do you reckon it a diſgrace to our *Palladium* that when both *Troy* and *Rome* were burnt, it was preſerved only by the care of man, and is it honorable for you to *worſhip* ſuch a *God* as only is preſerved by the ſame means from fire, thieves, and from brute beaſts? Is it rational for you to ask, as doth *Minutius*, *What can thoſe Gods do for the* Romans, *who could do nothing for their Votaries again the* Roman *Power?* And is it not as rational for us to ask what can that God do for us, ſhould we turn *Chriſtians*, who could do nothing for his Votaries againſt the Arms of the *Ægyptians*? Do you conclude that we contemn, affront, reproach theſe Gods we worſhip, by ſhutting of them up, and by appointing Keepers for them, and muſt not you be alſo deemed reprochers and contemners of your God, who have your *Keepers*, Locks,

Quid de ſenticis jam vetuſtate putridis dicam? quæ cum & portant, deos ipſos ſe geſtare humeris ſuis arbitrantur Lact. l. 1. c. 21.

Non ut Deus obſcure per cœli evolat ſydera, ſed velut animal brutum vehiculum quo. ſuſtineatur petit &c. Arnob. l. 7. p. 249.

[a] *Juſtin Cohort.* p. 2. *Athan. adv. Gent.* p. 13. *Tanto numini humana fuerunt præſidia neceſſaria. Jul. Firm.* p. 20.

Quid iſti dii pro Romanis poſſunt qui nihil pro ſuis ad verſus eorum arma valuerunt. p. 28.

Χρήζων ἀνθρώπους τοὺς θεοὺς φυλάττοντας ἵνα μὴ κλαπῇ. Juſt. ad Diogn. p. 492, 493.

Locks and Keys, for the ſecuring of your *Conſecrated Wafer?* Or is it ſo ridiculous to ſee our *Jupiter* hiding himſelf from the inſidiation of his *Father*, and is it not as worthy of our laughter to ſee what care you take to hide your God from the incurſion of an enemy or the inſpection of the Proteſtant? Or to ſecure him from the *Witch*, or the *Magician*, yea even the Mouſe or Rat? Is it an evidence, as your own *Jerom* hath declared, that *what is properly burnt cannot be God*, and muſt your *Hoſt*, which hath ſo oft been burnt, be *the Great God of Heaven?* Muſt the flames our *Hercules* endured declare he was no God, and will not the like flames declare the ſame touching your *Sacramental Jeſus?* Is it ſufficient confutation of our *Deities* that *they may be expoſed to ruſt or rottenneſs*; and is it not as good a confutation of your *Wafer God*, that he grows muſty, and is corrupted in the Stomach? Do you call upon us to conſider *what judgments may abide us for worſhipping that Earth on which the winds do blow, and the rains fall, and is ſubject to thoſe tremblings which do betray its fears and its infirmities*; and may we not entreat you to conſider what judgments you may look for, who worſhip ſuch a God, whom as you fear, and ſay, the flouds may drown, the wind may blow him quite away, and who hath often by our Earth been ſwallowed up together with the *Temples* where he did reſide? Doth it become you ſo magiſterially to ask touching our Gods, *Whether they be expoſed to winter colds, or ſummer heats, whether they lie obnoxious to the incurſions of an enemy, or to the bitings of wild beaſts?* when you yourſelves confeſs your God both may and often hath been ſubject to theſe Calamities, and make pro-

Κρυπτόμενον διὰ τὸ πατρὸς ἐπιβουλήν. Athan. contra Gent. p. 13.

In Eſ. l. 12. p. 73. B.

Hunc homines Deum putant? qui artus ejus & nervos cremari, &c. Lact. l. 1. c. 9.

Οὐ πάντα σαπρώματα; Οὐ πάντα φθειρόμενα. Juſt. ad Diogn. p. 492. 493.

Quid vos manet qui hæc cœlitis conſiderate. Jul. Firmic. p. 6.

Hiemalia ſentiant frigora, aut ſolibus torrentur æſtivis, &c. Arnob. l. 6. p. 191.

Indigetes illi cum ranis & piſciculis degunt. Arnob. L. 1. p. 20.

visions in your *Rubricks* for his defence against them? Do you laugh at our *Indigetes Dii, because they ſometimes live with Frogs and Fiſhes*, and may we not as freely laugh at your *Sacramental God* who doth not only often live with Rats and Mice, and ſuch like vermin, but even creepeth down into their Stomachs and their Guts? Do you render us little better than inſenſate creatures because we worſhip that which is blind and dumb, that which wants motion, life and ſenſe; and are you men of a much deeper reach who worſhip for a God that Wafer which is to all appearance as void of life, ſenſe, motion, as any of our *Statues* are? Do you cry out, *O your blindneſs!* because you once did pray *to an inſenſate ſtone, ſuppoſing ſome Divine virtue had reſided in it*; and is it leſſer blindneſs to worſhip a thin *Wafer* upon the ſuppoſition of *a Divinity united to it?* Doth your *Lactantius* ask concerning our God *Muta, what kindneſs can the dumb God do unto her Votaries*; and may not we with reaſon, ſay of your Conſecrated Wafer, *Quid preſtare colenti poteſt qui loqui non poteſt?* Is not our *Jupiter* ἀπομυῖος *i. e.* our *Scare-fly Jupiter* more worthy of our adoration, then is your *Sacramental Jeſus*, who is not able to ſcare away or to remove the fly that fals into, or drinks him up? Ceaſe then to pitty us, or to pronounce us blind, as doth your *Athanaſius, becauſe we bear a reverence to what is void of life*, when your own blindneſs doth more rationally deſerve our pitty. For do you judg it ſo abſurd *that we ſhould venerate a ſtone like unto theſe we tread upon*, and is it not abſurd in you to worſhip what is like unto that bread and wine which goeth down into the draught? Doth it ſpoil the credit of our Gods, *that other Gold and Silver*

Οὐ κωφὰ πάντα; ἃ τυφλά; ἃ οὐκ ἄψυχα; ἃ οὐκ ἀναίσθητα; Juſt. ad Diogn. p. 493.

Ventrabar, O cæcitas! lubricatum lapidem, tanquam inſit vis præſens adulabar. Arnob. l. 1. p. 22. L. 1. C. 20.

Clem. Πεδ. γρεπ. p. 24.

Contr. Gent. p. 37.

Ὅμοιον τῷ πατουμένῳ. Juſt. ad Diogn. p. 492.

Silver might have been made like them, had the Artificer ſo pleaſed; and muſt it not then crack the Credit of your *Sacramental God*, that other Bread and Wine, and other Wafers might, if your *Prieſt* had pleaſed to think upon them, been *as good Gods as he?* Do you laugh at us becauſe when we do Conſecrate our Wine unto the *Gods*, we ſay *mactus hoc vino inferio eſto*, adding *inferio* leſt we ſhould Conſecrate that Wine which is contained in the *Vintners Cellars*. When any *Roman Prieſt* can with *four words*, and an *intention* ſo to do, turn all the Wine in any *Merchants* Cellar into a Chriſtian God? Do you think it ſo abſurd that what Wine ſhall be Sacred to the Gods ſhould thus depend upon the will and words of *Heathen Prieſts*, when it depends upon the words and the intention of a *Roman Prieſt* what Wafer, and what Wine ſhall be *tranſubſtantiated* into the *Chriſtians God?* Do you ask *why we perceive not with the eyes both of our ſenſes and our minds, that what is partly burnt cannot be God*; when you yourſelves do not perceive that what is partly baked, and partly drunk in Taverns is no *God?* Do you admire at their blindneſs who, being *Heathens*, *thought their Gods might dwell in wood or ſtone, or ſuch like matter*, when being *Chriſtians* you are obliged to believe your God doth dwell in *Pyxes*, *Chalices*, and *Bottles*, and in the belly of a beaſt? Do you affirm that *we are contumelious to our Gods by ſhutting of them up in little houſes, and making for them little Cottages, and Cells, and Conclaves*; and are not you more contumelious to your *Jeſus* by making for, and cooping of him up in a ſmall Pix and Tabernacle? Is it ridiculous in us *to light up Candles in*

Juſt. Mar. ad Diogn. p. 493.

Ne vinum omni quod in cellis atque Apothecis eſt conditum eſſe ſacrum incipiat. Arnob. l. 7. p. 236.

Quid eſt aliud quam dicere tantum eſto mactus, quantum vole. Ib. p. 237.

Nec carnis nec mentis oculis aſpicit quod non poteſt eſſe deus, cujus pars igne combuſta eſt. Hieron. in Eſ. l 12. p. 78. B.

Divos afficiebam contumeliis cum eos eſſe credebam ligna, lapides, aut in hujuſmodi rerum habitare materia. Arnob. l. 1. p. 23.

Non prima & maxima contumelia eſt habitationibus deos habere diſtrictos, tuguriola his dare? Arnob. l. 6. p. 191.

Lucernas meridie vanas prostituere. Tert. Apol. C. 46. p. 35. Lact. l. 2. C. 4. p. 157.

in the daytime to our Gods; and must it not be so in Christians to do the like to their supposed God? Do you deride our *Jove* because he hath *a golden cloth upon him*, or *is adorned with pretious Garments*; and shall not we esteem your God more worthy of our laughter who hath more Cloths and Trappings than a *Lord Mayors* horse? Do you ask the *Heathen*, *whether by clothing of his Gods, he seeketh to defend them from the wind and cold, and heat, and other injuries of the weather*, when tis so easie to retort on you the same enquiry? Is it so prodigious *that our* Jupiter *should turn himself into a Bird, a Bull, a little Ant*, that *Saturn* should be turned into a beast, and *Æsculapius* appear in the more ghastly Visage of a *Serpent*, and it is not as great a *prodigy* that your own *Jesus* should be converted into the shape of a thin Wafer, or a drop of Wine? Is it so ridiculous to conceive our *Jupiter* should *be contracted into the lineaments of an Ant*; and is it less ridiculous to see your *Jesus* shrink his whole Great self into the smallest crum of Bread, or drop of Wine? If such things *gave men reason to suspect that they whom we adored as Gods were at the greatest distance from that sublimity*, as your *Arnobius* saith, permit us to suspect the same of your own *Jesus*. In fine, is it so great an infamy to our God *Fortune*, that the *Romans* brought her to a *Dunghil* to *be dedicated, thinking the draught a proper Temple for that God*; and is it not a greater infamy to your own *Sacramental Jesus*, that, as your *Origen* declares from his own words, *he goeth down into the draught?* Is it so horrid to conceive our *Saturn* should be turned in *Cacabulum*; and is it not exceedingly more horrid to conceive your God should be converted *in illud quod dicere nolo?*

Ab æstibus sese frigoribusque tutari. Arnob. l. 3. p. 118.

In Alitem, taurum, & quod omnia Genera contumeliarum transiliat, in formiculam parvulam. Arnob. l. 4. p. 145. ib. l. 7. p. 249, 250.

Dare ambiguis contradictionibus locum essetne verus deus an nescio quid aliud longeque ab supera sublimitate sejunctum. Arnob. 16. p. 250.

Φέροντες εἰς τὰ κοπρῶνα ἀνάθημαν αὐτῷ ἄξιον νεὼν τὰ ἀφεδρῶνα νέμαντες τῷ Θεῷ. Clem. Πεδαγωγ. p. 33. *In* Matth. xv. Tertul. in Apol. C. 13.

nolo? Let me then ſpeak unto your *Fathers*, and *Apologiſts*, in their own language, I mean the words of your *Arnobius*, *How impudent and ſhameleſs is it to reprehend that in another which you do yourſelves? to condemn others of ſtupidity and error when you yourſelves are guilty of like crimes*, and object that to the reproch of others which may be preſently retorted, and will reflect on you with greater infamy?

Cujus eſt pudoris, &c. l. 2. p. 93.

Erroris alios & ſtultitiæ condemnare & in erroris ejuſdem vitio deprehendi. l. 3. p. 109.

Hence we may be aſſured that the portentous Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, and of the Adoration of the *Hoſt* as God, was not acknowledged or received by theſe Antient *Fathers* who ſpake ſo many things which are moſt plainly inconſiſtent with, and perfectly deſtructive both to that Doctrine, and that worſhip. For, 1. Let any man of reaſon judg from what hath been diſcourſed, whether all theſe conſiderations which have been offered from Scripture, and from the *Fathers* to *expoſe Heathen* Gods to the deriſion, and reproch of all men, and to reclaim the *Heathen* from his Superſtitious follies, do not equally concern the *Roman Hoſt*! For that this *Hoſt* is Sacrificed and eaten, that it is carried on mens ſhoulders, or in their arms and hand, and ſtandeth in the place where it is ſet; that care is taken by them that he may not fall; that he already hath been ſtoln out of St. *Sulpitius* Church at *Paris*, out of the Church at *Boloyn*, and out of other Churches; that this God hath been carryed Captive, hath been purloyned by Thieves, *Magicians* and *Wizards*, that he is under Lock and Key, under the cuſtody of men, and is defended by Human Laws, and vindicated by Human Power, that he is often hid, and hath been often buried in the earth, that he hath been expoſed to the

Corol. I. §. X.

flames, and to the injuries of wind and weather, that he is ſometimes gnawed upon by things creeping out of the earth, that he hath not the uſe of eyes to ſee, or ears to hear, or hands to handle, or feet to go, that he doth dwell and hath been oft incloſed in *Pixes*, *Tabernacles*, in *Chalices*, and Bottles, that he hath Candles lighted to him of which he ſees not one, that he is clothed with coſtly Rayment, is ſtrangely *Metamorphoſed*, and laſtly that by confeſſion of ſome *Roman Doctors* he goes down into the draught, all this hath been already ſhewed, and cannot rationally be denyed, and yet all theſe are things objected by the Fathers to the reproach of *Heathen Deities*; theſe were the chief conſiderations which they offered to prove that *Heathen Gods* were but dumb *Idols*, or inferior Creatures, on theſe accounts they did continually charge the *Heathens* with Superſtition and *Idolatry*, and did endeavor to diſſuade them from the owning of theſe Gods, the practiſing that worſhip which they received from the Tradition of their *Fathers*. And can it reaſonably be imagined that they, who thus condemned others, did the ſame things themſelves, and only did invite them to exchange their *Heathen*, for a Chriſtian Deity, ſubject to all that infamy, contempt, and drollery which they caſt upon the *Heathen Gods*, and way of worſhip? Can it be reaſonably thought that all thoſe *Fathers*, if they had practiſed, and believed as now the *Papiſts* do, would ſpeak ſuch plain and frequent contradictions both to their practice, and their Doctrine, and talk as if they equally intended to confute, and render infamous the worſhip of the *Chriſtian*, and the *Heathen Deities*? Let any reaſonable perſon

ſon

ſon judg whether theſe apprehenſions and aſſertions, (*that to worſhip as a God what we do eat is an abominable and repugnant worſhip, a certain indication of the higheſt folly, ſtupidity*, and the extremity of madneſs,) could proceed from men who dayly worſhipped as the *Higheſt God*, what they themſelves did eat? or whether they who worſhipped as God that very *Hoſt* which they did ſacrifice unto God, could ſolemnly declare, as the forementioned *Fathers* often do, that *to adore as God what we or others Sacrifice, is to be Sacrilegious againſt God, and ignorant of the true knowledg of God, to be guilty of folly and Atheiſm; and to do that action which will juſtly render us a laughing ſtock to all our neighbors.* If this was the deportment of all thoſe *Holy Fathers*, we have juſt reaſon to cry out, *Ubi fides! ubi pudor!* and to conclude that they had not one Grain of honeſty, or ſhame, or prudence in them.

Since that this Wafer-worſhip hath obtained amongſt the *Latins*, what *Romaniſt* will ſay with *Origen*, the Sacrament, that is the God he worſhips, according to our Saviours words, is *voided at the draught*; with *Pſeudo Juſtin* that *what we eat or ſacrifice cannot be worthy of the name or honor of a God*: With *Cyril*, that *they are rude and ſtupid who carry up and down their God upon their ſhoulders*, or with St. *Chryſoſtom*, that *it is an hyperbole of madneſs to own that for a God which may be ſtoln.* Since then the *Fathers* without diſtinction, or exception, do frequently aſſert theſe things, and many more of the like nature, it is extremely evident that they were not worſhippers of the *Hoſt*, as is the preſent Church of *Rome*; for if no man would thus ſpeak who doth as the *Papiſts* do, ſurely theſe *Fathers* were

far enough from *Popiſh* practices in this particular.

Moreover let it be conſidered, 1. Whether the *Fathers* would afford the *Heathens* this great advantage to retort all that they argued againſt the worſhip of their Gods, and to aſſert that that which they condemned in them, was only what they dayly practiſed themſelves, and taught all *Chriſtians* to obſerve; which certainly they did, if they believed and practiſed as doth the preſent Church of *Rome*.

And, 2. Whether the *Heathens*, if this occaſion had been offered, would have been wholly ſilent, and negligent of this advantage? Put caſe, I ſay, theſe *Pagans* knew that all which by the Chriſtians was objected againſt their worſhip, and their Gods, was of an equal force againſt the *worſhip* of the *Chriſtian Hoſt*; that this *Hoſt* was owned by them as the *Higheſt God*, and yet was carried in their hands, becauſe it could not go, was kept by *Sextons* under Lock and Key, was ſometimes burnt, and ſometimes buried in the earth, that it was clothed with coſtly Raiment, ſhut up in Pyxes, and in Bottles, and was as void of all apparent ſenſe and life as any of the *Heathen Idols*; how could the *Heathens*, being acquainted with theſe things, and many others of like nature, abſtain from ſaying, *Thou art inexcuſable, O Chriſtian, whoſoever thou art, that judgeſt us on theſe accounts, for thou that judgeſt doſt the ſame things.* For further confirmation of this Argument conſider,

§. XI. 1. That the *Heathens* could not be ignorant of this ſuppoſed *Article* of *Chriſtian* Faith, and this ſuppoſed practice of the Church of *Chriſt*, provided that the *Chriſtians* really believed, and practiſed

practiſed always as doth the preſent Church of *Rome*. For,

1. The *Fathers* do themſelves declare that 'twas impoſſible they ſhould conceal from *Pagans* what was done in their aſſemblies; thus, to that falſe ſuggeſtion that *Chriſtians* did eat the blood of infants, that they were guilty of eating human fleſh, it is replyed by *Athenagoras*, that if the Chriſtians did ſo, it was impoſſible that having ſervants more or leſs, they could conceal this from them. *We increaſe dayly*, ſaith *Tertullian*, *and the more we do ſo, the more we muſt be hated; now the number of the guilty thus increaſing, how is it that the number of informers is not greater? Our converſation is more known, you know the days on which the Chriſtians meet, you oft beſet, detain, oppreſs us in our private meetings, but yet who ever came upon us whilſt we were eating of an Infant; were we guilty of theſe things, when any perſons came to profeſs the Chriſtian Faith, the Prieſt muſt firſt inform him that ſuch things were to be done*, or, being once admitted into their Communion, he muſt behold them done, *and how could ſuch a one*, ſaith he, *abſtain from the divulging of them?* And if the *Prieſt* did firſt inform him that if he would become a *Chriſtian* he muſt worſhip that which to all his ſenſes, would ſeem Bread and Wine, as *the Great God of Heaven*, or if, being once admitted to the Holy Sacrament, he was inſtructed ſo to do, and beheld all other *Chriſtians* doing ſo, how could this *Proſelyte* abſtain from the divulging of this worſhip? for this by *Infidels* and *Heathens was always judged*, ſaith *Bellarmine*, *a very fooliſh Paradox*, this was to worſhip a new God obnoxious to almoſt all thoſe follies and infirmities, which

Legat. p. 38. B.

Proficiente multitudine reorum quid ita non proficit multitudo nuntiatorum ad Nationes. C. 7. Apol. 7, 8.

Poſtea cognoſcant neceſſe eſt.

L. 2. *de Euch.* c. 12. §. 2. *Ex illis.*

which had engaged them to renounce their *Heathen Gods*.

2. That Christians could not conceal this practice from the *Jew* and *Gentile*, will be extremely evident from this consideration, that many myriads who embraced the Christian Faith were by the heat of persecution driven back to *Paganism*, and therefore were concerned to save their credit by divulging what they esteemed most lyable to exception in the *Christian Faith*, or practice, and therefore to divulge this foolish *Paradox*, as by the *Gentiles*, this plain impossibility, as by the *Jews* it was esteemed. For not to mention
2 Tim. i. 15. the *Apostacy* of all the *Asiaticks*, and of *Phygellus* and *Hermogenes*, when *Nero* raged against the
Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 4. c. 15. p. 129. *Christians*. The Apostacy of *Quintus* the *Phrygian* with many others under the persecution of
Epist. *ad* Trajan. l. 10. Ep. 97. Euseb. H. Eccles. l. 5. c. 1. p. 156, 160. & c. 2. p. 167. *Trajanus*, when *many who had formerly been Christians declared* to *Pliny* they had *ceased to be so*, *some three*, *some more*, *some twenty years ago*. Nor the revolt of those ten *Gauls* under the Persecution of *Aurelius Verus*, who fell, with many others from the *Christian Faith*, nor those who under the sixth *Persecution* were forced by the severity of torments which *Scapula* inflicted on them, to desert that Faith: I say not to insist on these less notable defections: St. *Cyprian* complains that by the fury of the eighth *Per-*
Ep. 8. §. 6. *secution*, *Christianity did suffer very much*, *that they were very few who then stood firm*; but *they*
Ep 9. §. 4. *who languished were very numerous*; *that the Church then with tears lamented the fall and funerals of*
De lapsis §. 2. *very many*; that *there was then a manifold decay of that once numerous people which professed the Chri-*
Ibid. §. 5. *an Faith*; *that even at the first onset of the threatning enemy the greatest number of the Brethren betrayed*

trayed their Faith. The like we find recorded by *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* even of the chiefeſt of the *Chriſtians*, at the firſt conflict in the tenth Perſecution *many thouſands* even of the *Rulers* of the *Church* apoſtatiſed ſaith *Euſebius*. Laſtly, who knows not that the *Apoſtate Julian* was once a Reader in the Church; and alſo that he received *Chriſtian Baptiſm*, and as a conſequent of that the *Bleſſed Sacrament?* That in the time of his *Apoſtacy* he prevailed on very many, *partly by flatteries, partly by bribes, and partly by torments to fly back to Heatheniſm*, and to renounce *the Chriſtian Faith*, as *Socrates* relates? Now it is abſolutely impoſſible that theſe *Apoſtates* ſhould be ignorant of ſuch a conſtant and notorious practice of the *Chriſtians*, as the adoration of the *Hoſt* muſt be, provided that it was then worſhipped by them as their God and Saviour.

Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 6. c. 40. p. 238. B. C.

Hiſt. Eccl. l. 8. C. 2. p. 294.

Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. C. 13.

§. XII.

2. It may deſerve to be conſidered in confirmation of this argument that both the *Jews* and *Heathens* left nothing unobjected which could with any ſhew of reaſon, be offered from any other doctrine or practice of *Chriſtianity*, or any fame concerning it, though never ſo ill grounded, againſt the *Deity* and *Worſhip* of our *Lord*, or the profeſſion of the *Chriſtian Faith*. They ſcoffed at all that any way was lyable to an exception from the *Conception* of our *Lord*, to his *Aſcenſion*. They very frequently declare that 'twas *impoſſible*, or at leaſt *incongruous that God ſhould be included in a Virgins Womb*, and that *it is unworthy of a God to be made man, or to appear unto us in the form of man, or to deſcend unto theſe lower Regions; that it did not become the ſon of God to fly to* Ægypt, *to eſcape the wrath of* Herod; *that a body ſo born, and nouriſhed with meat as our Lords body was, could*

Vel impoſſibile eſſe vel incongruens ut Deus in uterum ſe mulieris includeret. Lact. l. 4. c. 29. Arnob. l. 7. p. 249. Tatian. p. 159. Lact. l. 4. c. 22. & 29. *Celſus apud* Orig. l. 1. p. 51, 54. l. 2. p. 62. Minut. p. 25.

Lact. Ibid.

could not be deemed the body of a God, they confidently ſay that *Divine Majeſty could not ſubject it ſelf to thoſe infirmities which might expoſe him to the deriſion and contempt of men? Were Chriſt a God*, ſay they, *why did he make himſelf ſo weak, and ſo contemptible as to become obnoxious to puniſhment from men? Why did he ſuffer violence from mortal men? Why did he not repel their force by his Superior power? Why did he not ſhew forth his Majeſty before his death? Why was he haled, as impotent, to the judgment Seat, condemned as a criminal, or ſlain as mortal? Why laſtly was he not able to roul away the ſtone from his own Sepulchre, but needed an Angel to perform that work?* Now they who ſay theſe things, and offer theſe, as they ſuppoſed, convincing arguments that our *Meſſiah* could not be the Son of God, or a fit object of *Religious Worſhip*, could not have waved thoſe more plauſible pretences to except againſt his *Deity* which this ſuppoſed adoration of him in the *Hoſt* afforded. For is it not more incongruous that God ſhould be included in the Stomach, not only of the vileſt wretch, but of the meaneſt brute, than that he ſhould be for a time included in the hallowed womb of the moſt *Bleſſed Virgin?* Is it not leſs ridiculous to ſay God once appeared in the form and faſhion of a Man, than that he conſtantly doth lie concealed under the form of Bread and Wine? Is it unworthy of a God to fly to *Ægypt?* and muſt it not be more unworthy of him to be carried Captive thither? Is it beneath his *Majeſty* to take upon him the infirmities of living fleſh, and is it not much more beneath him to take upon him the infirmities of dead inſenſate fleſh, and even after his Aſcenſion to come down among us as inactive as *Æſops*

Celſus apud Orig. l. 5. p. 269.

God

God of Frogs? Is it abſurd to ſay that God deſcendeth to the Earth, and is it not much more abſurd to ſay that he deſcends into the Stomach or the Draught? Can not that be the body of a God which feeds on ordinary meat, and muſt that be his body which it ſelf is eaten? Doth not this Sacramental *Jeſus* make himſelf as weak, and as contemtible, and doth he not as much expoſe himſelf to the deriſion both of *Jew* and *Gentile* by this converſion into a little Wafer, as ever he was ſubject to in his infirmeſt ſtate on Earth? Is he not as unable in the Sacrament to ſcare away the Mouſe that gnaws upon him, as in the Sepulcher he ſeemed to be to roul away the ſtone? Doth he not ſhew leſs power there for the repelling of the *Thief*, the *Wizard*, the *Fly*, the *Vermin*, than whilſt he was on Earth he ſhewed for the repelling of his *Murtherers*? Can it rationally be ſuppoſed that they who did ſo conſtantly object all the fore-mentioned particulars to the reproch of *Chriſt*, and thoſe that owned and worſhipped him as God from the beginning of *Chriſtianity*, till the full triumph of it over *Heatheniſm*; ſhould never once object what in all theſe reſpects is more ridiculous, had they then known, what if it had been true, they muſt have known, *viz.* that this was then the faith and practice of the whole *Chriſtian World*, that every Chriſtian believed the *Sacrament* was *truly God*, and worſhipped it as *God?* In the declining Ages of the Church, when this *Idolatry* obtained among *Chriſtians*, the *Jew*, *Mahometan*, and *Heathens* did conſtantly deride and pour contempt on Chriſtians upon this account. Now the reproach of Chriſtians is not that they are *Galileans*, or worſhippers of him that *hanged on the tree*, but that

Si hostia Deus est, cur situ obductus corrumpitur? Cur à pluribus & muribus corroditur. Quæst. Jud. Amstel. Edit. An. 1662. p. 346.

that they are *God-Eaters*. On this account they do pronounce us, and that deservedly, to be the *most absurd and foolish Sect, that ever yet appeared in the world*; and ask so boldly, *if your Host be God, why is it that by waxing mouldy he corrupts? why is it that the Bats and Mice do gnaw upon him?* What then can be the reason that those more subtile *Heathens*, and malitious *Jews* which lived in former *Ages* of the *Church*, should offer nothing of this nature for their own defence, or the conviction of their adversaries; but only this, that the belief and practice of the Christians of those former times gave no occasion to these objections and retorts?

§. XIII.

Lastly, To strengthen and confirm the argument, it may deserve to be considered (1.) That the *Fathers* of the Church do very largely *answer*, and upon all occasions encounter all the other scruples which did possess the minds of *Hereticks*, or *Heathens*, and make them to suspect our *Jesus* could not deserve to be adored, or owned as a *God*, or that he did not really assume the nature and infirmities of man, or *verily* sustain the ignominies, and dolors of the Cross. When the *Marcionites* and *Valentinians* conceived it *was improper for the Son of God to be conceived in the Womb*; the *Manichees that it was an unworthy thing to think the God of Christians should issue from a Womb*; when *Nestorius* declared *that he could not endure to worship one that was two months old, or nourished with milk*. When *Julian* scoffed at the *Christians* for saying that *the Virgin Mary was the Mother of God*; when they, I say, suggested all these things, the *Fathers* spared no pains to satisfie them in all these particulars. *Lactantius* doth for this very reason insist more largely on one of these particulars, *because*

Turpe hoc Deo & indignum hoc Dei filio. Apud Tert. de carne Christi c. 4. *Apud August. contr. Faustum Manich.* L. 3. Cap. 6

Διμηνάτον καὶ γαλακτοτραφέντα μὴ ἀνάσχεσθαι προσκυνεῖν. Con. Ephes. Act. 3. p. 335. v. Act. 1. p. 265.

Θεοτόκον ὑμεῖς οὐ παύεσθε Μαρίαν καλοῦντες. apud Cyril. lib. 6. adv. Jul.

cauſe, ſaith he, *this very apprehenſion, that it was impoſſible, or at the leaſt incongruous, that God ſhould be included in a Virgins Womb, was that which cauſed many to turn Hereticks.* Now ſince it is extremely evident that it is more improper, incongruous, unworthy, to think the God of *Chriſtians* ſhould deſcend into, and be included in the ſtomach of the moſt vile communicant, in every *Pyx* and *Bottle* that contained the ſpecies of conſecrated bread and wine, in every *flye* that ſuck'd in the leaſt drop of Holy Wine, or every *Mouſe* that ſwallowed the leaſt crum of *Hallowed bread*, why is it that theſe Holy *Fathers* do never offer the leaſt word to rid this greater ſcruple out of the minds of men? or to *Apologize* for this *portentous incongruity*, compared to which, all that the *Heretick* or *Heathen* could object were very trifles? Why do they not conſider one of all thoſe great objections againſt the adoration of their *Sacramental Jeſus*, which from their very words we have collected? If you *reply* that they had no occaſion ſo to do, becauſe this *adoration*, nor any of the conſequents thereof, were ever ſcrupled by the worſt of *Hereticks*. I anſwer this is very true, that among all the formentioned *Hereticks*, and many other, who were ſo highly ſcandalized at the humiliation of our *Saviour*, that they denyed either his *Deity* or his *Humanity*, or the reality of all his ſufferings, we find not one that ever did except againſt the *adoration* of him in the *Sacrament*, againſt the eating of their *God*, the mixing of him with their ſpittle, or with the ferment of the moſt depraved *ſtomach*; during a thouſand years we find not one complaint from any *Heretick* that any *Chriſtians* owned or worſhiped a God who preſently went down into their ſtomachs, and

L. 4. c. 29. p. 448.

and was expoſed to the teeth of *vermine*; this *reply* therefore I confeſs is true, but then it is the ſtrongeſt confutation of the *adoration* of the *Hoſt*, and that *Tranſubſtantiation* which the *Romaniſts* aſſert, that can be poſſibly conceived, it being abſolutely impoſſible for any rational perſon to imagine that all thoſe *Myriads* of *Hereticks* ſhould be ſo highly ſcandalized at the *Croſs* of *Chriſt*, and thoſe infirmities he ſuffered in the fleſh, and yet that neither they, nor any other *Chriſtian* ſhould, for a thouſand years, once ſcruple, or be ſcandalized at thoſe greater imperfections, and more palpable abſurdities which this ſuppoſed *Sacramental God* was ſubject to; nay more, that they ſhould all believe, and ſhould allow that doctrine, and that practice which did moſt palpably refute thoſe very *Hereſies* which they had broached: this being a moſt perfect demonſtration againſt the *Ebionites*, *Photinians*, and all thoſe ſwarms of *Hereticks* who queſtioned the *Deity* of *Chriſt*, *that he was worſhipped with Latria in the Sacrament, only upon the preſumption of his Deity*, and therefore, if he there deſerved that worſhip, muſt be God. And this is alſo a perfect demonſtration againſt the *Marcionites*, *Docetæ*, *Valentinians*, and all thoſe *Hereticks* who held that Chriſt aſſumed *apparent*, but not *ſubſtantial fleſh*, that he had only the appearance of a body, but no true *real body*, and againſt the *Neſtorians*, and *Eutychians*, who taught, that after Chriſts aſcenſion *his human nature was abſorpt and changed into the divine*; againſt all theſe, I ſay, this is a perfect demonſtration, *that in the Sacrament Chriſts Body and his Fleſh are truly and ſubſtantially contained*, and therefore that he had a true ſubſtantial body, and that his human nature ſtill remains. At the cloſe of the *twelfth Century*,

Century, when this *Idolatry* began to ſhew it ſelf among the *Latins*, how many *Myriads* were branded with the name of *Hereticks* for their ſtiff oppoſition, both to this practice, and to the doctrine on which it doth depend; and can it be imagined that in all former *Ages* of the *Church* of *Chriſt*, in which ſo many *Hereſies* abounded, not any ſingle perſon ſhould once have broached this new *Hereſie*, more obvious than any of them all, had the known doctrine and practice of all former Ages adminiſtred the like occaſion ſo to do?

(2.) Theſe Fathers in their Apologies do very carefully take notice of any thing delivered by them which they imagined the *Heathens* might retort upon them. When *Theodoret* had confuted the *Heathen Polytheiſm*, and had confronted to it the *Rule* of *Moſes* and of *Chriſt*, *Who*, ſaith he, *doth command us to worſhip the Creator only*, N.B. he adds, that they perhaps may ſay *the Chriſtians are not obſervers of the rule, becauſe they worſhip the whole Trinity, and not the Unity excluſively*. And then he gives a copious Anſwer to that objection. In his ſeventh book having derided *Pagan* Deities, becauſe they ſeemed to be pleaſed with the blood and fat of beaſts, he very honeſtly confeſſeth that *Heathens* might plauſibly object the like againſt the God of *Iſrael*, *becauſe he alſo did require ſuch Sacrifices to be offered to him*. The very ſame objection is taken notice of, and anſwered by *Cyril* of *Alexandria*. Again the *Fathers* frequently object unto the *Heathens* that diverſity of *Sects*, and of opinions which was to be found among their *Philoſophers*, but then they ſpare not to acknowledg that this objection may be retorted againſt them, and then proceed to give what anſwer they think fit unto it. And when *Tertullian* had argu-

Τὸ σέβας τῆς ἁπάντων κελεύει φοβερὸν δημιουργῷ. Serm. 2. adv. Gr. p. 29. lin. 50.

Τετάρτα δὲ μεθόδα. ib. p. 30. lin. 1.

Ταῦτα ἴσως τινὲς ἂν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἴποιεν τοὺς Θεοὺς φάσκοντες πολιτεύεσθαι. p. 104. lin. 50.

Contra Julian. l. 4. p. 125. D.

Ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ πρὸς ταῦτα τις ἴσως ὅτι καὶ ἡμεῖς τι οὐ λέγομεν ὧν ταῦτα αἱρέσεις εἰσὶ πολλαὶ καὶ παρ' ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς; Cyril. contra Jul. l. 1. p. 9. A.

Hoc utique in Deum vestrum repercutere est. Apol. c. 41.

ed that the *Heathen* Gods must be unjuſt, if they by reaſon of the faults of *Chriſtians* were induced to hurt their own Votaries, he adds, that *Heathens might retort this argument upon the Chriſtians God*, and then proceeds to vindicate his God from that objection. And yet, if in his days the *Romiſh Sacramental God* had by all *Chriſtians* been acknowledged and adored, not only this particular, but almoſt all that he, and the forementioned *Fathers* had offered againſt the *Heathen Deities*, might have been evidently retorted, as we have ſeen already, on the Chriſtians God. Why therefore did they not confeſs ingenuouſly in all thoſe caſes, *hoc & in Deum noſtrum repercutere eſt*, that they might be retorted on the Chriſtians God? and ſpend ſome time in vindication of their Sacramental God from theſe retorts?

Corol. II. §. XIV.

3. From what hath been diſcourſed, we have as great aſſurance as ſenſe and reaſon, and the concurrent judgment of mankind can tender, that the *Hoſt* cannot be truly God, and conſequently that the *Trent* Council doth oblige all Chriſtians, as much as in them lyes, to worſhip that as God which is not truly ſo, and that the Members of the *Roman Church* are guilty of *Idolatry* by giving to it that worſhip which is due to God alone. This charge, I know, doth very much afflict the *Romaniſts*, becauſe they clearly ſee that if it be made good againſt them, our *Church* is juſtified in her refuſal of communion with them; ſeeing without conſenting to, and frequent practice of *Idolatry*, we cannot be admitted to communion with them, whence it will naturally follow that their *Church* muſt be as truly guilty of a wretched Schiſm, as *Jeroboam* and his ten tribes were, and conſequently that the *Major part* of the *Weſtern Church*

Church may be *Schiſmaticks*, by virtue of theſe impoſitions; and that no perſons ſeparating, on the account of the *Idolatry* required by the Church of *Rome*, from the external communion of that Church, can incur the guilt of *Schiſm:* that the *Roman* and other *Weſtern Churches* united with it, and the ſuppoſed head thereof, St. *Peter*'s imaginary Succeſſor, is not that true Church-guide to which we are obliged to ſubmit: that a reformation may be lawful againſt the definitions of that Church: that abuſes in Doctrine and practice may be reformed by a *National Church* againſt, and then much more without that *Authority:* that *National Churches* and *Councils* are not abſolutely ſubject to *Patriarchal*. Hence doth it plainly follow that the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, the Sacrifice of the Maſs, the half Communion, muſt be falſe: hence alſo it is evident that we cannot ſafely acquieſce in the judgment of the *Major part* of our Church Governours, concerning either the ſenſe of Scripture, the Doctrine of the *ancient Church*, or the conſent of *Fathers*, or any article of faith defined by them, nor ſafely practiſe all they do impoſe; and conſequently we may reſt aſſured they are not infallible, and therefore that there is no neceſſity for preſervation of the Church from *Sects* and *Hereſies*, that they ſhould be infallible, nor is there any promiſe of an infallible aſſiſtance in their definitions in the *Holy Scripture*; nor can it poſſibly be neceſſary to Salvation to believe the determinations of thoſe *Councils* which by the *Romaniſts* are ſtyled general. Hence alſo it is evident that there can lye upon us no obligation to believe or yield aſſent to any Doctrines defined by them, and conſequently that this ſubmiſſion is not the only means of ſuppreſſing *Hereſies* and

Sects; that to diſſent from any Doctrine received or defined by them can be no mark of *Hereſie*; that there may be great hazard to the vulgar in adhering to the deciſions of that *Church*, that a right judgment may be aſſured; that theſe *Church Governours* have erred in making this deciſion; that *Chriſtians* without this infallibility may be ſufficiently ſecure in points of faith; that certainty from ſenſe and reaſon may rationally be pleaded for ſome Doctrines againſt the definitions of that Church, and her ſuppoſed *General Councils*; that all that *R. H.* hath ſaid for confirmation of any of theſe propoſitions muſt be falſe. And laſtly, that if a Church committing and teaching *Idolatry* is no true member of the *Catholick Church*, the Church of *Rome* muſt ceaſe to be ſo.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The Contents.

The objections of the Romaniſts *againſt the charge of Idolatry are conſidered and anſwered: as,* 1. *The Objection that the Prophets have foretold that all Idolatry ſhould be extirpated by the preaching of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, is anſwered.* §. I. Obj. 2. *That if the Church of* Rome *be guilty of Idolatry then the whole Church of Chriſt, for many Ages, before* Luther, *muſt be charged with the ſame guilt, anſwered firſt in general.* §. II. *In particular by ſhewing,* (1.) *That Image Worſhip was not then received in the greateſt part of the Weſtern, and in ſome part of the Eaſtern Church.* §. III. (2.) *That the worſhip of Saints departed with mental prayer, or upon ſuppoſition of their acquaintance with the ſecret deſires of the ſupplicant, was then no article of faith in the Weſtern Church; nor is it yet received in the Eaſtern Church as ſuch.* §. IV. (3.) *That many in the Weſtern Churches did not then, and that the Eaſtern Churches do not yet give* Latria *to the Hoſt.* §. V. *That this practice is no neceſſary conſequent of the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, nor is it neceſſary that they who do maintain a Doctrine muſt practiſe every thing which follows from it.* ibid. *A large account of the* Greek *Maſs.* §. VI. *A full anſwer to all that* R. H. *offers from that Maſs, to prove the Hoſt is worſhipped with* Latria *by the* Greeks. §. VII. *In the times of* Arianiſm *Idolatry prevailed over the major part of the Church Catholick, and both*

the Fathers and the Romiſh Doctors *teach that in the time of Antichriſt it will prevail much more.* §. VIII.

§. I. THESE being therefore unavoidably the conſequences of this crime of which they are accuſed, not only by the Church of *England*, but all other *Proteſtants*, they do with all their wit and ſubtilty endeavour to demonſtrate the falſeneſs of this accuſation, and muſter up whatſoever they are able to produce and plead for their excuſe. And therefore whatſoever of this nature I have met with in their writings, I will impartially conſider, and then ſhall leave it to the judgment of the diſcerning Reader to determine whether that which they offer in their own defence doth carry in it any weight proportionable to what we have diſcourſed here, and other treatiſes have offered, to juſtifie this accuſation of the Church of *England*.

Object 1. And, 1. It is objected, that 'the Scripture doth 'inform us, and the Prophets have foretold us, that 'all *Idolatry* ſhould be extirpated by the preaching 'of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and that his Kingdom 'was always to continue, and therefore that the 'Church of Chriſt could not apoſtatize ſo far as to 'enjoyn and allow the belief and practice of *Idola-*'*try*. If Doctor *Stillingfleet* will not deny, ſaith *T.G.* 'what God hath promiſed by the Prophet *Zacha-*
P. 125. '*ry*, *Behold, the days come, and I will deſtroy the* 'names *of Idols from off the earth, and the memory* 'of *them ſhall be no more; and this not for four or* 'five *hundred years, but to the end of the world, for* 'the *Kingdom of Chriſt is to continue always*, let him 'give glory to God, and acknowledg his charge 'of *Idolatry* to be falſe, and that Chriſt hath done

'what

'what he promiſed to do, that is, to deliver us 'from all *Idolatry*. Now to this ſlender Argument, I anſwer, that the ſame Prophets have informed us that God did promiſe *to put his laws into the hearts of Chriſtians*; *that they ſhould never depart from him, that the knowledg of the Lord ſhould cover the earth as the waters cover the Sea*; *that the people of Zion ſhould be all righteous*. Let then *T.G.* give glory to God, acknowledg that the Church of *Rome*, which by their own confeſſions, and upon evident proof from all the writers of theſe Ages, was over-run by ignorance and barbarity, and overwhelmed with wickedneſs, during the 10, 11, 12, 13. *Centuries*, was not the *Church* of *Chriſt*, or elſe confeſs the vanity of his own inference. Moreover the ſame Prophets have informed us that the preaching of the Goſpel ſhould have this influence upon the world, that they ſhould *beat their ſwords into plow-ſhares, and their ſpears into pruning hooks*; *that Nation ſhall not lift up a ſword againſt Nation, neither ſhall they learn war any more*; that he would remove the *bow*, *the ſword*, *and the battle out of the earth*, and would make them to *lye down in ſafety*, and that they ſhould not *hurt or deſtroy in all his holy mountain*. Let then *T.G.* give glory to God, and acknowledg that *Rome Chriſtian* which hath been the cauſe of more wars, and ſhed more blood than even *Rome Heathen* did, is very unlike to be Chriſts holy mountain, or elſe confeſs the weakneſs of what he thus infers from this paſſage of the Prophet *Zachary*. Let him charge God with the failure of his promiſe, or confeſs that all theſe places do only ſhew that the Doctrine of the Goſpel doth naturally tend to work theſe bleſſed effects in all that cordially embrace it, though through

Anſwer 1.

Jer. xxxi. 33.
Eſa. xi. 9.
Eſa. lx. 21.

Mich. iv. 3.
Hoſ. xi. 18.
Eſa. xi. 9.

the perverſeneſs, luſts, the ſuperſtition and corrupt intereſts of men, it be far otherwiſe; and then he hath an anſwer to this ſlender ſcruple, *viz.* that what he cites from *Zachary* doth not affirm that after the coming of our *Saviour* there ſhould be no *Idolatry* amongſt profeſſors of *Chriſtianity*, but only that his Doctrine had a ſignal tendence to the extirpation of it, did not the wickedneſs and ſuperſtition of men, deſerted by God, and given up to the deluſions of the *Devil*, incline them to the practice of it. 3. The words of *Zachary* do only ſay, that God would cut off *Idols* out of the Land (of *Judah*) not out of the whole earth; he doth not ſay that God would cut off *all Idols*, but only the names of thoſe *Idols* which they formerly had worſhipped; in which ſenſe it was admirably true, for after their return from *Babylon* they ſuperſtitiouſly abſtained from that *Idolatry*, which they had formerly committed. And, 4. This objection may be as ſpeciouſly urged by the *Arian Idolaters*, and the whole *Heathen* world, as by the *Roman Church*; for ſince the words of *Zachary*, as they are rendred by *T. G.* contain a promiſe *that God would cut off the names of Idols from the earth*, it doth as much aſſure us that after the coming of our *Saviour*, and after the promulgation of his Goſpel, through the world, there ſhould remain no *Idols*, nor any *worſhip* of *Idols* in the whole ſurface of the earth, as that there ſhould remain no *Idols* amongſt thoſe who do profeſs the *Chriſtian Faith*.

§. II. If the Church of of *Rome*, ſay they, be guilty
R. H. diſc. p. 75. of *Idolatry* in worſhipping the *Hoſt*, or *Images*; or praying to departed *Saints*, then the whole Church of *Chriſt* for many Ages before *Luther*, muſt have been guilty of *Idolatry*; for the ſame practices,

practices, ſay they, for which we do affirm the Church of *Rome* to be *Idolatrous*, are, and for many Ages were uſed in the *Eaſtern Church*. *Anſw.* That the ſame practices on the account of which we do affirm the Church of *Rome* is guilty of *Idolatry* are, and for many Ages before *Luther* were uſed in the whole Church of Chriſt, can never be made good by *Roman Catholicks*; in anſwer therefore to this whole Argument it is ſufficient barely to deny, what they precariouſly do aſſert in this particular; and call upon them to prove that which they do with ſo much confidence affirm, by ſome more cogent and effectual *medium* than the pretended ſilence of *Hiſtorians* touching ſuch perſons as did not comply with this *Idolatry*. For, 1. There is no neceſſity that all who did not inwardly believe theſe Doctrines, ſhould outwardly declare ſo much, when they conſidered that they were likely to do themſelves the greateſt miſchief by a free declaration of their minds, and the Church but little good, by reaſon of the prevalency of theſe errors, and the blind Zeal of many for them. For if St. *Auſtin* in his days found reaſon to complain that ſome corruptions had ſo generally obtained that though he judged they ought to be redreſſed, yet, as he tells us, *he durſt not freely diſapprove them*; it is no wonder that, in theſe latter times of wretched ignorance and looſeneſs, men ſhould be more ſhy of reprehending thoſe corruptions which in their judgments they diſliked, concluding with *Eraſmus* that it was madneſs (though they were convinced as, he ſaith, he was, that it was very good that ſome things ſhould be changed that had obtained in the Church:) to hazard their own lives by ſpeaking their

Multa hujuſmodi propter nonnullarum vel ſanctarum vel turbulentarum perſonarum ſcandala liberius improbare non audeo. Epiſt. *ad* Januar. p. 372. *Dementiæ eſt tibi pernitiem accerſire, ſi nulli profis. Apud* Hotting. Hiſt. Eccl. Sect. 16. Part. 2. p. 29. *Vid. etiam.* p. 24, 25.

their minds freely, when they could do but little good, and being more desirous it should be done *by others than themselves*. Who knows not that when the reformation was begun by *Zuinglius*, and *Luther*, they were encouraged, and approved of by the best and the most learned of that Age? And that innumerable persons did presently embrace and testifie their approbation of their Doctrine, which is an evidence beyond exception of their good inclinations to it. Doth not *Elias* complain that all besides himself in *Israel* had shamefully revolted to *Idolatry?* and yet we are assured by God himself that he was certainly deceived. And if such a great *Prophet* erred in his judgment touching his own time, and his own *Country*, why may not you mistake in thinking that in the former Ages of the Church, all the professed members of it did bow the knee to your *Baal?*

2. There is no necessity there should be Histories or Records of all those persons who disliked any of the practices which commonly obtained in the Church; or were *possessed with that hatred of the false worship generally received*, as *Wesselus* was: or said as did *Domitius Calderinus*, when by his friends constrained to go to Mass, *Eamus sanè ad communes errores*. Nor,

Apud Hott. Hist. Ecc. Sec. 16. Part. 2. p. Cat. test. ver. 19. p. 867.

3. Is it necessary that all the Histories and Records of this kind which have been written should remain, and much less that they should continue perfect and uncorrupted, especially considering your Church, which had lately all the power in her hand, hath been so wickedly industrious by her *Indices expurgatorii* to corrupt all Histories, Records, and Monuments of Antiquity which make against her. But to omit all these advantages, I shall *ex abundanti* shew the falshood of

of this ſuggeſtion in all thoſe three particulars out of thoſe *Records* which yet remain, and have eſcaped her deſtructive hands: And,

1. *Idolatry*, as it imports εἰδώλου ἢ λατρείαν ἢ σχηματισμόν, *The worſhip or religious ſervice of an Idol, or the ſimilitude of any thing in heaven or earth made to be worſhipped in the ſervice of Religion*; I ſay *Idolatry*, in this, which is the prime and natural import of the word, was not the practice of the whole Church of Chriſt for many Ages before *Luther*: For, 1. The *German and the French Churches*, ſaith *Caſſander*, *after the Council held at* Frankfort, *moſt conſtantly continued for ſome Ages in that ſentence which they firſt received from the Church of* Rome, viz. *That Images were neither to be broken nor yet to be worſhipped.* If then the *German* and *French Churches* continued firm in this opinion for ſome Ages after the *Council* held at *Frankford* A. D. 794. they muſt have conſtantly maintained it in the VIII. and the IX. Centuries. And that they held the ſame opinion in the IX. *Century* is evident from *Agobardus* Biſhop of *Lyons*, who was made Biſhop by conſent of the whole Clergy of that *Nation*. For he wrote a Book againſt this *Image-Worſhip*, wherein he hath declared, that *it is contrary both to Scripture and Tradition and the Doctrine of the Old* Roman *Church*; and alſo that *whoſoever worſhips any molten or graven Image doth not honor God, or Angels, or holy men, but Idols*; and in which he doth fully Anſwer the exceptions and evaſions of the *Roman* party. And yet *Balhuzius* and *Sirmondus* do ingenuouſly confeſs that *Agobardus* hath writ only that which the whole Church of *France* did then acknowledge. Moreover in this IX. *Century* the *Second Nicene Synod* was declared

§. III.

Conſult. Cap. de Imag. p. 201.

Sect. 30.

Sect. 31.

Quod omnes tum in Gallia ut etiam Sirmondo obſervatum eſt conſentiebant Balhuz. Not. in Agobar. p. 88.

to

to be a *Pseudo Synod*, or falsly to retain the name of *Synod*, because it Decreed for Image-worship, by *Hincmarus Rhemensis*, and *Ado Viennensis*. In the X. *Century* it is so stiled by *Regino Abbas Prumiensis*, In the XI. by *Hermannus Contractus* an Author of great Credit and Reputation in the world. And that the *Germans* continued of the same mind in the XII. *Century*, is evident from the plain words of *Nicetas Choniates* who saith that then *among the Germans* and *Armenians the worship of Holy Images was equally forbidden*. And that the *French Church* then believed the Doctrine of the *Second Nicene Council* to be against the definition of the *Orthodox* and *Antient Fathers*, is evident from the Continuator of *Aimoinas*, who plainly tells us that *the Fathers of the Nicene Synod otherwise decreed concerning Image-worship, than the Orthodox Doctors had before defined*. And *Ivo Bishop* of *Chartres* then declared this to be the judgment of the *Council* of *Eliberis*, *that Pictures ought not to be worshipped, but that they only should be memorials of what is worshipped*. Was it then received by the *French* Church in the XIII. *Century?* No, *Durandus* a *French Bishop* in his *Rationale* doth expresly say, *we do not worship Images*; and he moreover gives this admonition to them that do so, *If neither men, nor Angels are to be worshipped, let them consider what they do who under pretence of Piety do worship divers Images, for it is not lawful to worship that which is made with hands*. Was it then received in the XV. *Century?* No, *Gerson Chancellor* of *Paris* who flourished *Anno Domini* 1420. saith, *we do not worship Images, and that they are forbidden to be worshipped*, and that the words of the commandment, *Thou shalt not bow down to them nor*

L. *contra Hincmar. Laudun.* Cap. 20.

Ad. A. D. 792.

A. D. 794.

Chron. A. D. 794.

Lib. 2. de Imp. Isaachi Angel. f. 193.

De Gestis Francorum, l. 5. c. 28.

Nos illas non adoramus, l. 1. c. 3. *Num.* 1.

L. 4. C. 39. N. 3.

Comp. Theol. in explic. præcepti primi. Ed. Paris. 1606.

nor worſhip them, muſt be thus interpreted, *Thou ſhall not bow thy body or thy knees unto them, thou ſhall not worſhip them with the affection of thy mind.* When therefore was it that this Image-worſhip obtained in the *Gallican* Church? Anſw. *Pithœus* doth ingenuouſly confeſs that it is but of yeſterday; *If we be willing*, ſaith he, *ſeriouſly to confeſs the truth, it is but very lately that our people began to be in love with Images.* Præf. *in* Hiſt. P. Diaconi.

Moreover in the VIII. *Century* it was condemned by * *Alcuinus* (Tutor to *Charles the Great*, and Scholar of *Venerable Bede*) who wrote an Epiſtle againſt the *Synodal Book* of the *Second Nicene Council*, wherein it was aſſerted *that Images ought to be worſhipped*; which Epiſtle being marvelouſly confirmed by the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, he carried to the *French King* in the name of the *Engliſh* Biſhops and *Princes*. This Image-worſhip was condemned alſo by the Church of *England* in the XII. and XIII. *Centuries*: For *Simon Dunelmenſis* an *Oxonian* Doctor, and *Roger Hoveden* their chief Profeſſor, and *Matthew Weſtmonaſterienſis* do all concurr in this aſſertion, that in the *Second Nicene Synod* are many things contained which are *inconvenient*, and *contrary to the true faith*, *and that in that Council was eſtabliſhed a Decree that Images ſhould be worſhipped*, *which thing the Church of God wholly abhors.* Where note that in theſe Writers we find not the leaſt hint of a diſtinction betwixt *due and undue worſhip* of an holy Image, or betwixt *worſhip which the Church of Chriſt allows*,

* *Karolus Rex Franciæ miſit Synodalem librum ad Britaniam, ſibi à Conſtantinopoli directum, in quo, proh dolor, multa inconvenientia & veræ fidei contraria reperiebantur, maximè quod pœne omnium Orientalium doctorum unanimi aſſertione confirmatum fuerit, Imagines adorari debere, quod omnino Eccleſia Dei execratur, contra quod ſcripſit Albinus Epiſtolam ex authoritate divinarum Scripturarum mirabiliter dictatam illamque cum eodem Synodali libro in perſona Epiſcoporum & principum noſtrorum Regi Francorum attulit.* Hoveden Annal. Part. 1. *ad* A. D. 792. Simeon Dunelm. *ad* A. D. 792. M. Weſtmonaſt. A. D. 793.

and

and worſhip which the Church *abhors*, nor do
P. 146. they ſay the *Nicene Council* doth aſſert *eam adorationem Imaginibus deberi quam Eccleſia Dei execratur*, as *T. G.* in his tranſlation of theſe words, doth very fraudulently inſinuate, but they ſay only that the ſecond *Nicene Council* had declared *Imagines adorari debere, quod Eccleſia Dei execratur*, that Images were to be worſhipped, and that this was the Doctrine which Gods Church abhorred.

It was condemned in the XIV. Century, by *Robert Holcot*, one of our Country men, and Profeſſor in *Oxford*, who plainly doth aſſert, *That no*
Com. *in* lib. Sap. Cap. 13. *voce Infelices.* *adoration is to be given to any Image, nor is it lawful for any man to worſhip Images.*

It was condemned in the XV. Century, by
In Canone Miſſæ, lect. 49. *Gabriel Biel*, an *Oxonian Doctor*, who determines that to be the trueſt Sentence which holds, *That any Image is not to be worſhipped, either for it ſelf conſidered as it is wood, or ſtone, or metal, nor yet conſidered as a ſign or Image.* And that the Chriſtian faith permits them to be reſerved in the Church, *non ut ipſæ adorentur, not that they ſhould be worſhipped, but that the minds of faithful men might be excited to give reverence to them whoſe Images they are.*

It was condemned, in the ſame Century, by
De vanit. ſcientiarum. cap. de Imagin. *Cornelius Agrippa*, who ſaith, *That the corrupt cuſtom and falſe Religion of the Heathens hath infected our Religion, and hath introduced into our Church Images and Idols, and many barren pompous Ceremonies, none of which were found or practiſed among the primitive profeſſors of Chriſtianity.* It was condem-
De invent. rerum. l. 6. c. 13. ned by *Polydore Virgil*, who doth acknowledg that it is teſtified by St. *Jerom*, that *almoſt all the antient Fathers did condemn Image-worſhip for fear of Idolatry.*

It

It was condemned in the XVI. Century, by the excellent *Caſſander*, who ſaith, *It was to be deſired that our predeceſſors had ſtood firm in the opinion of their Forefathers*, viz. *that Images were neither to be worſhipped, nor to be broken down.* And page 210, *It ſeemeth fit*, ſaith he, *to be adviſed, if matters could be thus contrived, that things ſhould be reduced to that moderation which they obtained in the more antient Church of* Rome, *and* Germany, *and* France; *ut rerum gerendarum monumenta, non cultus inſtrumenta habeantur*, that is, *that Images be uſed or retained as monuments of things paſt, but not as inſtruments of worſhip.* *Conſult: cap. de Imagin.* p. 205.

It was condemned in the ſame Century, by *Ferus* a very Learned Perſon, who Preached at *Mentz:* for he expreſly ſaith, that *Images are tolerated in the Church, that they may admoniſh, not that they may be worſhipped, for otherwiſe they can admit of no excuſe.* And to aſſure us that his private judgment was very ſutable to the prevailing judgment of thoſe times, we find the ſame determination made by a Council held at *Mentz*, A.D. 1549. during the Seſſion of the *Trent* Council, which ſpeaks thus, *Let our Paſtors accurately teach the people that Images are not propounded to be worſhipped or adored, but that we may by them be brought to the remembrance of thoſe things which we ought profitably to call to mind.* *Com. in Act. Apoſt. cap. 7. C. 14.*

It was condemned alſo by the Church of *Cologn*, which ſaith thus, *We Chriſtians, when we bend our knees before the Image of the Holy Croſs, do not adore the very wood, but him who died upon it for our ſins*, and doth conclude with *Gregory* the *Great*, that *it is not lawful in any wiſe to worſhip any thing that is the work of our own hands.* *In Antididag. Colon. cap. de Imag.*

More-

Moreover, from the XII. Century to the Reformation, it was condemned by the *Waldenſes*, the *Albigenſes*, and the *Huſſites*, who ſpread themſelves throughout the greateſt part of *Europe*, and propagated their Doctrine through *France*, *Spain*, *England*, *Scotland*, *Italy*, *Germany*, *Bohemia*, *Saxony*, *Polonia*, *Lithuania*, and other Nations.

Dr. *Still.* defence. p. 837. 838. Laſtly, This Image-worſhip was condemned by the *Armenians*, from the VI. Century, to this preſent time. For they having begun their Schiſm before this practice found any countenance in the Church of Chriſt, not only do refuſe to worſhip Images, but roundly do pronounce *Anathema* on them that do ſo.

§. IV. 2. We ſay the *Roman Church* is guilty of *Idolatry* in worſhipping the Saints departed, becauſe they worſhip them with *mental prayer*, believing that they underſtand the ſecrets, or inward motions of the hearts of them who put up to them *mental prayers*. Now this we ſay was never any Article of Faith, even in the *Latine* Church, till the *Trent Council* had determined that *they who ſaid it was a fooliſh thing to put up mental prayers to Saints departed were guilty of impiety*, and did pronounce *Anathema* on *all that held or thought the contrary*; till then, I ſay, it was no Article of Faith, even in the *Weſtern Church*: For in the XII. Century, this Queſtion was moved by the *Maſter* of the *Sentences*, whether the *Saints* do hear the prayers of ſuppliants, and the deſire of petitioners do come unto their notice; and this *Anſwer* is returned to it, that *it is not incredible that the ſouls of the Saints, which in the ſecret of Gods preſence are joyed with the illuſtration of the true light, do in the contemplation of it underſtand the things that are done abroad, as much*

Seſſ. 25. p. 527, 528.

Lomb. Sent. l. 4. Diſt. 45.

much as appertaineth either to them for joy, or to us for help. *Anſelmus Laudunenſis* who lived in the ſame Century notes this, that *Auſtin ſaith, that the dead, even the Saints, do not know what the living do, no not their own ſons.* Hugo de Sancto Victore ſaith that, *the ſpirits of the dead be there where they do neither hear nor ſee the things that are done, or fall out to men in this life*; and again *the dead indeed do not know what is done here whilſt it is here in doing*; and *Gratian* reſolveth the ſame queſtion *by the Authority of* Eſaiah. In the XIII. *Century* we are informed by *Altiſſiodorenſis* that many did affirm *that we do only pray improperly unto Saints, becauſe we pray to God that by the merits of the Saints we may be helped.* N. B. And *Alexander Halenſis* determines that *God alone is ſimply to be invoked, and that the Saints rather pray with us, than are prayed to by us.* In the XIV. *Century*, *Gabriel Biel* having ſet down the reaſons which in his time were urged againſt this opinion *that the Saints departed knew the deſires of men on earth*, confeſſeth that they moved not only *Hereticks* but other *Chriſtians* to deny it, and at the laſt concludes no more than this, that *it is probably ſaid that God reveals all things which are offered to them by men, whether in magnifying and praiſing them, or in praying to them, and imploring their help.* And the determination of *Scotus* is in effect the ſame, *viz.* That *it is probable that God doth ſpecially reveal to him that is in bliſs ſuch of our prayers as are offered to him.* And *John Sharp* in the Univerſity of *Oxford*, did publickly diſpute theſe queſtions, of praying to the Saints, and praying for the dead: *becauſe*, ſaith he, *it was eſteemed by ſome famous men*, and *not without probability*, N. B. *that ſuch ſuffrages and prayers*

Gloſs interl. in Eſa. lxiii.

L. 2. *de animâ.*

Decr. p. 2. Cauſ. 13. qu. 2. cap. 29.

In Sum. Part. 4. l. 3. Tr. 7. qu. 6. cap. *de* Orat.

Qu. 92. M. 1. Art. 4.

In Can. Miſſ. lect. 30.

Ibid. lect. 31. *In* 4. Sent. diſt. 45. qu. 4.

Proœm. in queſt. de orat. ſanctorum, &c. Miſſ. in Bibl. Coll. Mert. Oxon.

were

were ſuperfluous in the Church of God, although ſome other wiſe men thought the contrary; whence it appears that what is now *de fide*, (if indeed it be ſo) was then only probable; and might as freely have been denyed by *Orthodox* and Pious *Chriſtians*, and perſons famous in their times, as by reputed *Hereticks*. In the XV. *Century* the *Thaborites* maintained that the *Saints Triumphant* were not to be prayed to. And in the XVI. Century *Caſſander* freely doth confeſs *that it was not neceſſary to hold that the Saints did underſtand our prayers*. And of this judgment were the *Waldenſes* from the XII. *Century* to the Reformation, of whom St. *Bernard* doth confeſs that *they derided them who prayed to Saints*. Æneas Sylvius *that they judged it vain to ask the ſuffrages of Saints departed ſeeing they could not help us*; and *Seyſel* adds *that they affirmed that the petitions which were put up unto the Bleſſed Virgin, or any other Saints, were vain*. Now theſe *Waldenſes* had ſuch multitudes of followers as cauſed *Bernard* to complain; *That by reaſon of them, the Churches were left without people, and the people without Prieſts*.

Æn. Sylv. de Orig. Bohem. c. 35.

Ep. 19. ad Joh. Molin. p. 1109. Edit. Pariſ. 1616.

In Cant Serm. 65.

Hiſt. Bohem. cap. 35.

Adv. Sectam Valdenſ. p. 68.

Bern. Ep. 240.

2. Although ſome of the *Eaſtern Churches* do put their petitions to Saints departed, yet they ingenuouſly confeſs they do it not upon an apprehenſion that the Saints do hear them, but only becauſe they judg this ſervice acceptable to God whether they hear or not, they therefore may be rationally charged with *ſuperſtition* in this caſe, but not with that *Idolatry* which is now taught and practiſed, or at the leaſt allowed of by the *Church* of *Rome*; becauſe they do not pray to Saints departed, upon ſuch principles as do aſcribe unto them *the knowledg of the heart*, or do require or ſuppoſe in them any farther knowledg

ledg than is consistent with a creature: this will be evident from the confession of the *Greek Patriarch*, who saith in the behalf of his whole Church: *We do not invocate properly the Saints, but God, for neither* Peter *nor* Paul *hear any of those that invocate them, but the grace and gift that they have according to the promise, I will be with you to the end of the world.* 2. This will be still more probable from that opinion which is generally received among them, *viz. that the Saints before the day of judgment, do not enjoy the beatifick Vision*; this is the judgment of the [a] *Russians*, the [b] *Moscovites*, the [c] *Greek Church*; of the [d] *Armenians* and [d] *Maronites*, and more especially of the [e] *Jacobites* who believe that the souls of just men do remain on the earth till the day of judgment. Now in the judgment of the most famous *Doctors* of the Church of *Rome* our prayers are only to be directed to such Saints as do enjoy the *Beatifick Vision.*

1 *Resp. Patriarch. Hieros. ad Theol. Wirtemb.* cap. 21.

[a] *Sacranus* p. 34.
[b] *Brietw.* p. 13.
[c] *Scarga.* l. 2. c. 12.
[d] *Brietw* p. 174, 179.
[e] *Brietw* p. 154.

That practice which we now insist on as the most clear and undeniable conviction of the *Idolatry* committed in the *Roman Church*, *viz.* the adoration of the *Host* as God, was not in any *Age* before the Reformation, nor at the Reformation, nor is it yet the practice of the whole *Church* of *Christ.*

§. V.

For, 1. The Doctrine of Transubstantiation on which it depends, was, by the confession of some learned *Romanists*, no Doctrine of Faith before the *Council* of *Lateran*, and *if it had not been for that* Council, *it might*, say they, *even now be lawful to oppugne it*; It was, say others, *not very antient, it was determined of late*; the truth of which confessions hath been irrefragably made good by Mr. *Aubertin.*

V. Dr. *Whitby* Idol. of the R. Ch. p. 875, 99, 100.

2. About the time of the Reformation this Doctrine was not owned by all Christian Churches; for 'twas rejected by the *Lollards* in *England*, the *Waldenses* in the Confines of *France* and *Italy*, by the *Thaborites* and *Hussites* in *Bohemia*. It was then, and is still rejected by the *Armenians*, as is apparent from the testimony of *Nicephorus* and their own *Liturgy*, and by the *Habissines*, or midland *Æthiopians*, whose Liturgy, as even the *Jesuites* confess, is stuffed with errors, and among others with this that *they affirm the bread to be Christs body*, which, as *Bellarmine* and others do confess, can be true only in a *Figurative* and *Metaphorick* sense.

Albertin, p. 965. 977. 978, 982, 986, 987.

Britan p. 173. V. Jon. Lasic. de Rel. Arm. Lit Æthiop. Alphons. Jes. Edit. A. 1526.

2. Although we should admit that all the *Eastern Churches* do at present hold that Christs body is corporeally present in the *Holy Sacrament*, yet hence it will not follow, as some *Romanists* conceive, that they do worship with *Latria* this most *Holy Sacrament*: For our *Lords* Body is no due object of *Latria*, and that his Soul and his Divinity is there united to his body, they do not affirm, nor can it be collected from these words, *this is my body broken, and my blood shed for you*, his body broken, and his blood shed, being his body and his blood disunited, or in a state of actual separation from his soul: if you collect from reason, that if his body be there present, his Divinity must be there also, because it is united *hypostatically* to the body, and therefore never separated from the body, as *R. H.* frequently insinuates. I answer, 1. That if we must not be permitted to use our reason to confute this Doctrine, neither are you to use your reason to establish it; for why a demonstration against a Doctrine should not as well destroy the

supposed

ſuppoſed truth of that Doctrine, as a demonſtration for it ſhould confirm its truth, I am not able to conceive. Beſides, is it a contradiction to aſſert that *Chriſts Almighty power* may reproduce his body, not thus united to his ſoul, and his Divinity, or not! If it be not, then may his body be thus extant in the *Holy Sacrament*: If you ſay it is a contradiction to aſſert that the ſame body ſhould be united to the word, and not united; I *Anſwer*, if the ſame body of our Lord, may be both eaten, and not eaten, eaten by them who have received the *Hoſt*, and not eaten by them who have not yet received, eaten in the *Hoſt* received, not eaten in the Hoſt *reſerved*, if it may be under the ſpecies of bread, and not under the ſpecies of bread, under the ſpecies of bread as it is in the *Holy Sacrament*, and not under the ſpecies of bread as it is in *Heaven*; why may it not be united to the word, and not united to the word, united to the word as it is in Heaven, but not united to the word as it lies ſenſleſs on the *Altar*. When therefore *R. H.* doth ſo often mind us *that Chriſts body was never ſeparated from the divinity*. I *Anſwer*, that this is a moſt certain truth, when it is ſpoken of his *Natural* and Glorified body, but is not ſo when it is ſpoken of his Sacramental body, of which ten thouſand things may be aſſerted, which agree not to his *Celeſtial* body.

3. As it is certain that the *Lutherans* do hold the Conſecrated Elements to be Chriſts real body and blood, and yet do never tender the worſhip of *Latria* to them, ſo may the *Eaſtern Churches* alſo do, nay it is certain that they do not tender the worſhip of *Latria* to them, as the *Papiſts* do, and are obliged to do by the cuſtom and command of their *Church*. *Sacranus* doth inform us of

the *Ruſſians*, that they do not adore the Conſecrated Elements. Neither the *Greeks*, nor *Ruſſians* do perform any worſhip to them, ſaith the *Jeſuit Scarga*. The *Greeks* after the Conſecration of the Elements exhibit none or very little reverence to them, ſaith *Arcadius*; moreover the *Cophti*, and the *Habaſſines* do not ſo much as elevate the *Conſecrated Hoſt*, nor afterwards reſerve it, as doth the Church of *Rome*, which is a farther evidence that they do not adore it with the worſhip of *Latria*.

L. 3. *de Sacr. Euch.* c. 21.

Britan p. 158, 167.

But ſaith *R. H. this adoration is a neceſſary conſequent of the belief of the real preſence*; to this I *Anſwer*, 1. by denying that this is any neceſſary conſequence of the belief of *Tranſubſtantiation*, and if it were ſo, we have hence reaſon to preſume the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* cannot be antient, ſeeing this neceſſary conſequence of it was not obſerved in the *Weſtern Church* before the XI. or XII. Century, this *adoration* being not practiſed, and much leſs enjoyned by the Church till then, as Mr. *Daly* hath demonſtrated. 2. I *Anſwer*, that nothing is more frequent than for *Churches*, and perſons to maintain a doctrine, and yet in practice to diſclaim the neceſſary conſequences of that doctrine. I hope *R. H.* doth urge againſt us nothing, but what he thinks will neceſſarily follow from our doctrine, and yet he knows we do diſclaim his inferences, and may, in due time, ſhew him we have ſufficient reaſon ſo to do.

Guide diſc. 3. ch. 8. §. 82. n. 3.

De Cult. Lat. l. 7. cap. 44. & l. 3. cap. 19.

§. IV.

And whereas *R. H.* doth endeavour to prove that the *Greek Church* agree with them in giving of this adoration to the Conſecrated *Hoſt*, from certain paſſages of the *Maſs* uſed among them; that the diſingenuity and weakneſs of his

Ibid. p. 265, 266.

pleas

pleas may be more evident, I ſhall at large relate their manner of proceeding in the performance of their *Maſs*, and then return a ſatisfactory *Anſwer* to what he offers from theſe paſſages for confirmation of his vain preſumption. Firſt then the *Greeks* begin this *Maſs* with worſhipping or bowing thrice towards the Eaſt before the *Image* of our *Saviour*, and of the *Bleſſed Virgin*. Soon after they bow thrice before the *Table* on which the *Sacred Gifts*, that is the Bread and Wine is placed, though yet they be not laid upon the *Altar* to be Conſecrated. Then the *Prieſt* ſaith, *O God be propitious to me a ſinner, and have mercy on me*; and again, *O our Saviour, thou being nailed to the Croſs, and pierced with a Spear, haſt redeemed us from the Curſe of the law, and opened the fountain of eternal life, glory be given to thee*; then taking the *Oblation* (*i. e.* the Bread which hath the figure of a *Croſs* impreſſed upon it, called *Sigillum*) into his left hand, and the ſpear into his right hand, he faſtneth the Lance into the right ſide of the *Croſs* upon the Bread, and ſaith *he was brought as a ſheep to the ſlaughter*; then faſtning it in the left ſide, he adds, that *as an innocent lamb which is dumb before the ſhearer, he openeth not his mouth*: then faſtning it in the upper part of the *Croſs* he adds, *in his humiliation his judgment was taken away*; then he faſteneth it in the lower part and adds, *who can declare his Generation*? Then the *Deacon* ſaith *elevate Sir*, and the *Prieſt* elevates the Holy Bread with his Lance ſaying, *his life was taken away or lift up from the earth*. Then the *Deacon* ſaith *ſacrifice Sir*, and the *Prieſt* ſacrificeth *him*, N. B. ſaying, *The lamb of God which taketh away the ſins of the world is ſacrificed for the life and ſalvation of the world.*

Which are all taken from the Author of the Tract ſtyled *Perpet. de la Foy*, &c. and anſwered by Mr. *Dally de Cult. Lat.* c. 3. c. 19.

Chryſoſt. To. 6. p. 583.

Ἐμπεσὼν ὁ σκηπτοῦχος. p. 94.

Ib. l. 29, 30.

Ib. l. 35, 40.

Ib. l. 39.

Ib. l. 41.

L. 43.

P. 585, l. 1.

Ib. l. 5.

L. 8.

L. 10.

L. 13.

L. 14. Then the *Deacon* ſaith *pierce him Sir*, and the *Prieſt pierceth him* with the Spear ſaying, *one of the*
L. 16. *Soldiers with a Spear pierced his ſide, and forthwith came forth blood and water.* After this follows a Prayer to this effect, *O God our God, who*
P. 985. *ſenteſt the living bread which is the nouriſhment of the whole world*, viz. *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to be our Saviour and Redeemer, bleſs this oblation, and receive it upon thine heavenly Altar.* After this the *Prieſt* and *Deacon worſhip* thrice before the *Holy*
P. 987. l. 30. *Table*, then the *Prieſt* takes thence the *Holy Goſpel*,
P. 989. l. 42. and gives it to the *Deacon*, and ſo they make their *leſſer ingreſs*, and both *bow their heads*; then
P. 990. the *Deacon* brings the *Holy Goſpel* to the *Biſhop*, if he be preſent, and he *kiſſeth* it, if he be not preſent, the Prieſt *Salutes* it, then all the
Goar Not. in Miſſ. Chryſoſt. p. 125. n. 74. people *Reverence* the Goſpel, the *Prieſt* or *Deacon* ſaying, *Come let us worſhip and fall down to Chriſt*;
P. 990. l. 17. then the *Deacon* elevates it, ſaying Σοφία ὀρθή
Ib. l. 18. *this is the true wiſdom*; then the *Deacon* worſhipping, and the Prieſt after him, they bring it to the *H. Tribunal*, and ſo the *Deacon* doth again place it on the *Holy Table*, and afterwards worſhipping it with reverence, the *Deacon* comes to the
P. 991. Desk or Pulpit where the *Holy Goſpel* is to be
p. 992. read, and the *Prieſt* ſaying, *let us hear the Holy Goſpel*, the *Deacon* reads it; then followeth a
Ibid. Prayer of the *Catechumens* intreating God to *look favourably upon them who bow their necks to him*; after this followeth a Prayer ſaid by the *Prieſt* ſilently, *that God would enable him his Prieſt,*
P. 994. *by the power of the Holy Ghoſt, to ſtand before his holy Table, and offer his holy and immaculate body and his precious blood*; *for to thee*, ſaith he, *do I bow my neck, that thou wouldeſt grant that theſe gifts may be preſented, or offered to thee, by thy*

ſinful

ſinful and unworthy ſervant, for thou art he that offers and art offered, received and given, Chriſt our Lord, or as the words may be rendred, *who doſt preſent and art preſented, who receiveſt, and art given*; then they adore three times, and then the *Deacon* ſaith *God be merciful to me a ſinner*; then Ib. l. 34.
ſaith he to the *Prieſt*, *elevate Sir*, who removing L. 38.
the Veil called the *aer*, which covered the *Holy Diſh and Cup*, the *Deacon* takes the *Holy Diſh* upon his Shoulders, and the *Prieſt the Cup*, then coming to the *Holy Altar*, they ſay to themſelves Ib. l. 44.
Bleſſed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord, then when the *Holy Diſh* is taken down from the *Deacon*, the *Prieſt* ſpeaks thus, *Joſeph an honorable* Κηδεύσας p.
perſon taking thy incorruptible body from the Croſs 995.
wrapped it in fine linnen, and preparing it for burial with ſpices, laid it in a new Sepulcher; then L. 13.
they bow thrice before the *Holy Table*, then followeth a Prayer, after the placing of the *Holy Gifts* upon it, *that God would enable them to offer* Ib. l. 35.
gifts and ſpiritual Sacrifices, for their ſins, and grant them to find grace before him, and that he would accept their ſacrifice, and cauſe his Holy Spirit to reſt upon them, and upon the gifts there preſent. Soon after the *Prieſt* worſhips thrice and P. 996.
ſaith, *I will love thee, O Lord my ſtrength, my fortreſs, and refuge*, and after him the *Deacon* wor- Ib. l. 30. L. 31.
ſhips thrice; then ſaith the *Prieſt*, *lift up your* P. 996. l. 43. P. 997.
hearts, the people anſwer, *we lift them up unto the Lord*; then ſaith the *Prieſt*, *let us give thanks unto the Lord*, the people anſwer, *it is juſt and meet to worſhip the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt*; then the *Prieſt* relates how *our Lord Jeſus in the night in* Ib. l. 25.
which he was betrayed took bread, and bleſſing, hallowing and breaking of it, he gave it to his diſciples, ſaying; then the *Prieſt* bows his head,

and

and bleſſeth the Holy Bread, ſaying with a loud
L. 30. voice, *this is my body broken for you*, and of the
L. 40. *Cup, drink you all of this, this is my blood of the*
Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν. *New Teſtament ſhed for you*, &c. then the *Prieſt* adds, *out of thine own we offer thine own to thee.* All
L. 35. which is done *the doors of the Chancel being ſhut*,
Goar Not in and the people ſeeing nothing that is done; then
Miſſ. Chryſoſt. the *Prieſt* adds this Prayer, *We offer to thee this rati-*
p. 139. n. 132. *onal and unbloody ſacrifice, beſeeching thee to ſend*
p. 998. *thy Holy Spirit upon us, and upon theſe gifts that are before us*; then the *Prieſt* and *Deacon* worſhip
Ib. l. 10, 11. thrice, before the *Holy Table*, and ſay, *God be merciful to me a ſinner*; then ſaith the *Deacon*,
L. 17. *bleſs Sir the Holy Bread*, ſo the *Prieſt* croſſeth thrice the Holy Gifts, and ſaith with a low voice, *make*
L. 18. *this Bread the precious body of thy Chriſt*, to this Prayer the *Deacon* ſaith *Amen*; then ſaith the *Deacon*, *bleſs Sir the Holy Cup*, and the *Prieſt*
L. 21. bleſſing it, ſaith, *make that which is in the Holy Cup*
L. 23. *the precious blood of thy Chriſt, changing them both*
L. 28. *by thy Holy Spirit*; and ſo the *Deacon* doth reve-
L. 30. rence *to the Prieſt*, then after the Lords Prayer the
P. 1001. *Deacon* ſaith, *bow down your heads to the Lord*, the people anſwer, *we bow down Lord to thee*; then the *Deacon* bowing down his head a little, and ſeeing the *Prieſt* worſhipping, doth himſelf worſhip, and to let us know that this worſhip is performed *to God the Father*, this Prayer imme-
L. 8. diately follows, *Look down, O Lord, from Heaven upon us that bow our heads to thee, for we bow not to fleſh and blood, but to thee, the dreadful God, turn thou, O Lord, the myſteries which lie before us, to us all for good, according to our ſeveral needs, for the ſake of thy only begotten Son*, then follow-
L. 20. eth the Prayer cited by *R. H. Attend, O Lord*, &c. then the Prieſt and Deacon worſhip, ſaying thrice,

thrice, *God be merciful to me, a ſinner*, and all the people alſo *worſhip*, but all this is done before the elevation, and whilſt the people do not ſee the *Hoſt*. When the elevation is made (which yet the people do not ſee) the *Prieſt* ſaith, *Holy things to Holy perſons*, and the people anſwer, *there is one Holy, one Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; then the *Prieſt* breaks the Holy Bread, and ſaith, *The lamb of God is broken and divided, the Son of the Father who is broken but not divided, who is always eaten, but not conſumed.* Then the *Deacon* worſhips, and after that the *Prieſt* giving him the Holy Bread, he takes it; and both bowing their heads before the Holy Table, the *Prieſt* ſaith, *I believe, Lord, and confeſs that thou art Chriſt the Son of the living God*, &c. and again, *Lord I am not worthy that thou ſhouldeſt come under my ſordid roof.* Then calling the *Deacon* to receive the Cup, he comes and worſhips, ſaying, *behold I come to the immortal King*; and again, *I believe Lord and confeſs*, &c. as before, then they open the Gate of the *Holy Altar* or *Tribunal*, and the *Prieſt* and *Deacon* taking the Cup with reverence, ſay to the people, *come with fear of God and Faith*, and the people anſwer, *bleſſed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord*, and ſo the Bread and Wine are diſtributed to them.

L. 24, 26. *Non ita tamen ut à populo conſpiciatur elevat Græca ſacerdos* Goar. Ibid. n. 158. l. 28, 30.

L. 35.

P. 1002.

P. 1003.

L. 13.

L. 14.

§. VII.

From this ſhort view of the *Greek Maſs*, it will be eaſie to anſwer all that *R. H.* offers to perſuade us that the *Hoſt* or that the Body and Blood of Chriſt, contained under the ſpecies of Bread and Wine, is worſhipped with *Latria* by the *Greek* Church. And,

1. That they give the worſhip of *Latria* to the Sacrament, or Conſecrated *Hoſt* cannot be proved from any adoration which the *Prieſt* performs before

before he takes the Holy Bread to communicate with it, or from the Reverence the *Deacon* doth exhibit before he receives the *Chalice*, or from the adoration of the people.

For, 1. It is not certain that this reverence or worſhip is exhibited by *Prieſt* or *Deacon*, or by the people, to the *Sacrament* there placed upon the Table, and not to Chriſt ſpiritually and inviſibly preſent: The contrary ſeems to be plain from that Prayer which doth immediately follow the admonition to perform this reverence. For the Deacon having ſaid, *bow down your heads to the Lord*, the Chorus anſwers, *we bow down, Lord, to thee.* Then the *Prieſt* Prays thus, *We give thee thanks, O inviſible King, who workeſt all things by thine infinite power; look down O Lord from heaven upon us that bow our heads to thee. We bow not to fleſh and blood, but to thee the dreadful God, turn thou O Lord the myſteries which lie before us, to us all for good for the ſake of thine only begotten Son.* Which Prayer is evidently made not to fleſh and blood, not to the myſteries themſelves, and therefore not to the Hoſt, not to our *Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, but to God the *Father for the ſake of his Son Chriſt*, to him therefore was the adoration both of *Prieſt* and people made. 2. Suppoſe we that by theſe actions they intended to reverence the Conſecrated Hoſt, it will not follow that they did reverence it as God, but only as a Sacred Creature. We ſee they worſhip and bow before the *Image* of our *Lord*, and of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, before the *Holy Table*, and the *Gifts*, they worſhip the *Holy Bible*, and bow when they receive the *Hallowed Gifts*, or *Holy Bible* into their hands, and both the *Deacon* and the *people* worſhip the *Prieſt* that Celebrates, and yet

Lit. Baſ. *apud* Goar. p. 166.

Sym. Theſſal. p. 225. *apud* Goar.

yet I hope *R. H.* doth not imagine that they intend to give *Latria* to the *Priest*, the *Bible*, the *Gifts*, the *Table*, or the *Image* of the *Blessed Virgin*; that therefore which in the Mass they often do to things which are not in their own judgments, fit objects of the highest worship, can be no evidence, when it is done unto the Host, that they intend to pay the worship of *Latria* to it.

2. Nor doth this follow from the Prayer thus cited by *R. H. Attend, O Lord Jesus Christ, from thy Holy Habitation, come and sanctifie us, who resideſt above with Father, and here art invisibly present with us, and be pleased by thy mighty hand to communicate to us thy immaculate body, and thy precious blood and by us to all the people.* Where note 1. That *R. H.* fraudulently leaves out these words καὶ ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης τῆς Βασιλείας σου, which plainly do demonstrate this Prayer is made not to the Sacrament, nor yet to Christ considered as invisibly present there; but to Christ sitting on the Throne of his Kingdom. 2. Here is no Prayer directed to the *Host* or *Sacrament*, as in the *Roman Liturgies*, but only an acknowledgment that Christ invisibly is present with them whilst they celebrate by his powerful virtue in the Sacrament, on which account the Priest saith, *Christ is in the midst of us*, and in this sense they do conceive him present in the Sacrament of Baptism, and present in the *hallowed Gifts*, and present when the *Gospel* is read.

Guide *ubi Supra.*

Which words are in both the Liturgies of *Basil* and St. *Chrysostom*, and are only left out in *Amphilochius de vita Sancti Basilii.* Goar. not. in Miss. Basil. p. 187. Sym. Thessal. *apud* Goar. p. 229. & 222. Πάρεσο καὶ νῦν *Off. Sancti Baptism.* v. Goar. p. 353.

Nor will this follow from that Prayer which the Priest tenders to Christ saying, *Enable me thy Priest by the power of the Holy Ghost to stand be-*

Ἀξίωσον προσηνεχθῆναί σοι τὰ δῶρα ταῦτα σύ γαρ εἶ ὁ προσφέρων καὶ ὁ προσφερόμενος καὶ προσδεχόμενος καὶ διαδιδόμενος Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν. p. 994. l. 25.

fore

fore thy Holy Table, and offer thy Holy and immaculate body, and thy pretious blood, for to thee do I bow my knee, and grant that theſe Gifts N. B. *may be preſented to thee by thy ſinful and unworthy ſervant*, for thou art he *who offereſt and art offered, who receiveſt, and art given, Chriſt our Lord*, where 1. Obſerve that this Prayer is ſaid long before the Conſecration of the Elements, the bowing therefore of the *Prieſt* to Chriſt, is only to him ſpiritually preſent with the hallowed Gifts. Note 2. That theſe words *thou offereſt, and art offered*, &c. are ſpoken immediately of the oblation of the hallowed Gifts which the Prieſt is ſaid προσφέρειν *to preſent* (not of Chriſts body and his blood which he is ſaid ἱερουργεῖν *to ſacrifice*) in theſe Gifts Chriſt is Typically repreſented, and is given; becauſe there is an Image and repreſentation or demonſtration, as ſaith *Cabaſilas*, of his paſſion, and yet Chriſt doth receive them upon his Heavenly Altar, and doth preſent them to the Father.

Ἀντίτυπα δεσποτικοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματός εἰσι. Sym. Theſſ. 16. p. 225.

Apud Goar *Not in* Chryſ. Miſſ. N. 36.

Miſs. Chryſoſt. p. 985.

Sym. Theſſ. p. 233.

4. This practice is not proved, becauſe the *Eaſtern Churches* ſay after the Conſecration, *God be merciful to me a ſinner*, for this they often ſay before the Conſecration; it is ſaid by the *Deacon* when he prepares the *Holy Diſh* and *Cup*, when he doth fume the Sacrament not yet Conſecrated, and in many other places. Will therefore *R. H.* plead that they make ſuch addreſſes to the *Holy Diſh*, and *Cup*, and the *Unconſecrated Elements*.

M. Chryſt. p. 984.
Ib. p. 994.
M. Baſil. p. 169. apud Goar.

Nor 5. Will it avail to prove this practice, that when the Cup is *Elevated*, and when the *Laity* are called to come with fear and love, they ſay, *bleſſed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord*, for this is alſo ſaid before the Conſecration by the

the *Prieſt*, and *Deacon* at the Completion of the *greater ingreſs* of the hallowed *Gifts*, and by the people before the *Conſecration*. M. Chryſoſt. p. 994. Ib. p. 997.

Nor 6. From the *Prieſts* ſaying, when he Elevates the Conſecrated Bread, *Holy things to Holy perſons*, to which the Quire anſwers, *there is one Holy, one Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, for though *R. H.* conceives this is ſo ſpoken in relation to the *Elevated Hoſt*, and is a confeſſion that the *Hoſt* is that *Lord Jeſus Chriſt* they ſpeak of, yet *Symeon Theſſalonicenſis* will inform him, that it is only *an unanimous confeſſion of the Incarnation of the Son of God, who reigneth over all*, and that it is *as if they ſhould have ſaid, Who of us is pure, who holy? there is one only holy Jeſus Chriſt, who lovingly doth ſanctifie us.* Apud Goar. p. 228.

Nor 7. From what the *Prieſt* ſaith when he breaks the Conſecrated Bread into four pieces, viz. *the Lamb of God is broken and divided into parts, the Son of the Father who is broken, and not divided, eaten, and not conſumed, but ſanctifieth thoſe that partake of him.* For the Conſecrated Bread being broken in memory and imitation of Chriſts Paſſion, it being broken, *the Lamb of God, and the Son of God* may be ſaid to be broken, it being diſtributed and eaten; *the Lamb of God* may well be ſaid to be ſo, as alſo to be cut into four parts; though I ſuppoſe *R. H.* will not allow ſuch a diſſection of the true *natural body* of our Lord; and not only of the Conſecrated Bread they ſay *break him Sir*, &c. but of the Unconſecrated Bread *pierce him Sir, Sacrifice him Sir*, and when the Prieſt hath pierced the Gifts he ſaith, *One of the Souldiers pierced his ſide; when he ſacrificeth them*, he ſaith, *The Lamb of God which taketh away the ſins of the world is ſacrificed,* Ὁ ἱερεὺς μελίζων αὐτὸν εἰς τέσσαρα, λέγει, μελίζεται καὶ διαμελίζεται ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. Chryſoſt. Miſſ. p. 1001. Goar *in Not* M. Chryſoſt. p. 163. Miſſ. Chryſoſt. p. 985.

ficed, will therefore *R. H.* hence infer that they believe the *Unconsecrated* Bread and Wine to be *naturally* and properly *the Lamb of God* and truely *sacrificed*? if not, he cannot make the like inference from the like words used after Consecration.

Nor, 8. Is this proved from that Confession and Prayer which the *Priest* makes when he prepares himself for the reception of the Holy Sacrament, *viz. I believe, Lord, and confess that thou art Christ the Son of the living God*, and again, *Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my sordid roof*: For, 1. The Priest indeed confesseth that *Jesus* is the *Christ the Son of the living God*, in the words of St. *Peter*, but not that the *Sacrament* is so, he now makes that Confession for himself which a little before the people had made for themselves, which was to do what every tongue at the last day should confess, saith *Thessalonicensis*, viz. *that Jesus was the Christ, to the glory of God the Father*. 2. The Prayer which follows this Confession is, *that this Jesus would make him partaker of his precious body and blood*, wherefore the Priest doth not direct his Prayer to the *body and blood*, but only to Christ for them. 3. The Priest sollicites Christ to enter not only into his body, but his Soul, into which Christs Body cannot enter, that he would *unite them to the holy body and blood of Christ, that worthily receiving the holy Mysteries they may have Christ dwelling in their hearts, and be made the Temple of the Holy Ghost*; not surely Christ as to his body, but his word and Spirit, and so they do themselves expound themselves, praying that *they partaking of the sanctified things, and being enlivened by them, may be united to Christ their true*

Matth. xvi. 16.

Apud Goar. p. 228.

Ἐνωθῶμεν τῷ ἁγίῳ σώματι καὶ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ σοῦ. Mill. Bas. *apud* Goar. p. 173.

true God (who ſaith, *he that eateth my fleſh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him*) *that his word dwelling and walking in them they may be made the Temple of the Holy Spirit.*

Miſſ. Myſt. *ante conſecrat.* apud Goar. p. 197, 198.

Nor laſtly will this follow from the *Deacons* ſaying, when he is called to receive the Sacrament, *behold I come to the immortal King:* For, 1. He doth not ſay, *the Sacrament is that immortal King*, but only that Chriſt preſent, or in the midſt of them aſſembled is ſo; Chriſt being therefore inviſibly preſent as they aſſure us, and he himſelf hath promiſed, in all his Ordinances, and more eſpecially in this by which he ſpiritually dwelleth in, and is united to the due Communicant, well may he ſay when he receives thoſe Elements with which ſuch bleſſings are conveighed, *behold I come to the immortal King*; 2. It is their cuſtom in their *Liturgies* to ſpeak of that which repreſenteth any thing, as if it were the thing it ſelf. They ſpeak of the *Holy Bible* as if it were *Chriſt* himſelf, when it is carried by the *Prieſt*, they ſay, *come let us worſhip Chriſt*, when the *Prieſt* enters with it into the *Chancel*, they add *lift up the gates*, *viz.* that the King of Glory may come in. Becauſe this Goſpel bears ſome repreſentation of the Son of God; thus alſo in the Office of *the little Habit*, and the *Angelick Habit*, the Superior tells the *Monk* when he ſtretcheth forth his hand unto the *Goſpel*, *behold Chriſt is inviſibly preſent here*, when the *Monk* takes the *Sizzers* out of the *Goſpel*, *thou takeſt* them, ſaith he, *from the hand of Chriſt*, and why may not the Sacrament be ſtyled the *Immortal King*, by the ſame *Metaphor* by which the *Goſpel* is here ſtyled Chriſt, without intending to perform any higher worſhip to it, than what they pay unto the *Goſpel*.

Goar in Miſſ. Chryſ. n. 110.

Goar in Miſſ. Chryſ. n. 74. Sym. Theſſ. ib. p. 222.

Ἰδοὺ ὁ Χριστὸς εἰσερχόμενος ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις πύλαις. Goar. p. 478. 510.

Ἰδοὺ ἐν τῷ χειρὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λαμβάνεις αὐτό. Ibid.

v. *Dallæum de* Cult. lat. l. 7. cap. 11.

What *R. H.* further urgeth from *Cabasilas* is only from a false Translation, and so deserveth no consideration.

Sacramentum debito cultu tractet, religiose colat. Humiliter adorent. Genuflexus adorat. Rit. p. 63, 64. Missal. *sæpius. vide ibid. Rythmum S. Thomæ ad S. Eucharistiam.*

To conclude, there be two signal differences betwixt the worship of the Host prescribed in the *Roman Church* and that which is observed in the *Greek*; that whereas in the *Mass* and *Ritual* of the *Roman* Church, we find frequent injunctions *Religiously to worship, and humbly to adore the* very *Sacrament*, and frequent intimations of *worship due unto it*, whereas they pray unto the *Sacrament*, and frequently acknowledg it to be their God, there is not any thing of this nature to be found in any of the *Eastern Liturgies*.

2. Whereas the *Roman Host* is by them worshipped as God, not only during the Celebration of the Sacrament, when Christ invisibly is present, but also when it is placed upon the *Altar*, and there [a] reserved in the *Pyx*, and when it is carryed in *Procession*. The *Eastern Churches* have no such custom of placing it upon the *Altar* in a little *Box*, or carrying it in [b] *Pomp* to be adored by the people; now in these adorations performed to the reserved *Hosts* consisteth more especially and plainly, the *Idolatry* of *Roman Votaries*.

[a] *Sacramentum Eucharistiæ non servatur apud nos in templis, ut fit hic apud Europæos. Christoph. Licanatus Æthiopum legatus apud* Hotting. Hist. Eccl. Sæc. 16. p. 44. *vide Damian. à Goes de Moribus Æthiop.* p. 506.

Οὐ περιφέρομεν δὲ τοῦτο τὸ ἅγιον μυστήριον διὰ τῶν πλατειῶν, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνον ὅταν κομίζεται εἰς οἶκον νοσοῦντος, ὅτι οὐ δέδοται ἡμῖν τοῦτο ἵνα περιφέρηται διὰ τῶν πλατειῶν, ἀλλ' ἵνα εὐλαβῶς μετέχηται. Metroph. Critopulus.

§. VIII.

But 2. If by the Christian world *R. H.* and others do understand all Christians without exception declaring for, and practising those things which we esteem *Idolatrous*, we say that no such

Idolatry

Idolatry hath been admitted by the *whole Church of Christ*, but if they understand only the greater part of *Prelates*, or the most numerous part of *Christians*, and say, as *R. H.* doth, that they must be reputed as the whole, I *Answer* that *Idolatry* may in this sense prevail over the *Christian Church*, as formerly it did over the Church of *Israel* and *Judah*. For as in the days of *Elias* there was so great *Apostacy*, as that the *Prophet* said, *I only am left alone*, and yet God had his Church preserved in those 7000 *who bowed not their knees to* Baal, so may it also be in the Church of *Christ*, there may be an *Apostacy* so great as to prevail on the most numerous party in each *Christian Church*, and yet there may remain, besides those numerous Churches and Persons we have reckoned up, even many thousands of the *Roman Church* who did not in their hearts believe, or in their practices submit to their *Idolatry*. The *Roman Doctors*, as well as *Antient Fathers*, do acknowledg that this hath been the state of *Christians*, and that it shall be so again; they do acknowledg that when *Arianism* prevailed, thus it was; the second *Nicene Council* informs us that *Arius*, *Aetius*, *Eunomius*, *Eudoxius*, and others were the men *by whom the Devil brought again into the Christian world that Idol-worship which had been rooted out*, and that through the assistance of the *Emperors*, *the disease grew strong and prevalent*, *so that all principalities contended for it*, saith the *Latine*, *were over-powered by it*, *saith the Greek*, *and when almost all the world had joyned themselves to the prevailing part*, *God raised up St.* Basil, *as an* Elias *under* Ahab, *to support the Priesthood which after a manner was now fallen*. This is the relation of that great *Apostacy* made by *Gregory Nyssen*

Guid. disc. 2. c. 5. §. 63. n. 2.

Act. 6. p. 409.

Ἐκλείπουσ᾽ ἤδη τ᾽ εἰδωλολάτρειαν.

Τῆς τοιαύτης ὑπερμάχεσθαι νόσου. Ibid.

Καὶ πάντων μικρὸν δεῖν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τὸ ἐπικρατὲν μετατεθέντων. Ibid.

who lived in these times, and approved by the *Second Nicene Council*, and more particularly by the *Author* of the answer to the *Constantinopolitan Synod*, and the truth of this assertion hath been proved already from the clear testimonies of *Nazianzen*, *Basil*, *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, and divers others, to whom add that of *Athanasius* who compares the Pious and Orthodox in his time to *Elias and the Prophets*, *hid by* Obadiah *in a Cave*, and who tells us that *where there were any Orthodox persons, they did either thrust themselves into the Dens and Caverns of the Earth, or solitarily wander in the Deserts.* Now let the indifferent Reader judg whether from such sayings we find no ground to affirm *that Arianism at any time had infected or possessed a major part of Christianity*, as R. H. *confidently saith*, and whether when these things were spoken *no question could be made but that the major part of the Prelates of the Universal Church professed the Catholick Faith.* I am sure the words of the forementioned *Fathers* by no means will admit of such a sense, and therefore *R. H.* thought fit not to produce them, but to spend a long *Harangue*, full of intolerable faults, in confutation of their testimonies, under the Covert of confuting *Protestants*. Moreover it is the judgment both of the *Fathers*, and of *Roman Catholicks*, that when the reign of *Antichrist* prevails, the Church will be reduced to the like Estate. St. *Basil* considering the wonderful prevalency of *Arianism*, crys out, *hath the Lord quite deserted his Church, is it the last hour, and doth the defection now take place by which the Son of perdition is to be revealed.* *St.* Jerom saith, *however it may seem at the first view absurd, he that considereth that of the Apostle, in the latter days there shall*

v. Whitbics Answ. to *Cressie*, ch. 9. §. 21. p. 118.

Ep ad Solit. vitam agentes.

Guidt. disc. 2. ch. 2. §. 26. n. 2.

Ibid. §. 27. n. 3.

Ep. 71. p. 864.

In Sophon. c. 2.

ſhall be perillous times, &c. *and that of Chriſt, when the Son of man cometh, ſhall he find Faith upon the earth? will not wonder at the extreme deſolations of the Church, which by the reign of Antichriſt will be brought to ſolitude.* Theophylact on that of Luke, *ſhall he find Faith on the earth?* ſpeaks thus, *the Lord asketh the queſtion becauſe then there ſhall hardly be found any Faithful, for ſo greatly will the Son of perdition prevail as to ſeduce, if it were poſſible, the very Elect*, And St. *Chryſoſtom* adds that *the ſacrifice of Chriſtians will be deſtroyed by Antichriſt, Chriſtians will fly to the Deſerts, none being left either to enter into the Church, or offer an Oblation to God.* Add to this that *Prophetick* teſtimony of St. *Auſtin, that in the time of Antichriſt the Church ſhall not appear, being eclipſed by the perſecutions of ungodly men*, and that of *Ephraim Syrus* (or whoſoever is the Author of that Tract which bears his name) *that men ſhould ask whether the Goſpel be continued upon earth? and anſwer ſhould be returned in the negative.* And thus that place in *Daniel* Ch. ix. 27. *He ſhall cauſe the Sacrifice, and the Oblations to ceaſe*, is expounded by *Hilary*, and by *Hippolytus* and by *Apollinarius* of the time of *Antichriſt*.

Chap. xviii. 18.

Op. imperf. in Matt. Hom. 49.

Ep. 80. ad Heſyc. p. 236. P. 219. Edit. Colon. A. P. 1603.

v. Hitron in locum.

And in this the *Fathers* are followed by whole Troops of *Papiſts*, *in the times of Antichriſt*, ſaith Pererius, *there ſhall be no ſacrifice in publick places, neither ſhall any publick honor be given to it: the Holy Fathers tell us*, ſaith the ſame Pererius, *that then all Chriſtians ſhall be either Martyrs, or Apoſtates, or ſhall lie concealed like wild beaſts in Dens and Solitudes.* Lyra upon the *Theſſal.* ii. 2. ſaith that *the Apoſtle ſeems to ſpeak of a departure from the Catholick Faith, not that all ſhall recede from it, but that the major part ſhall do ſo.* Bellarmin

In Dan. p. 888. Non quod omnes ſanta fide Catholicâ, ſicut exponunt aliqui, receſſuri ſed quam major pars credentium diſcedet à fide. De Pontifi. Rom. l. 3. c. 7.

L. 13. Doct. Prin. c. 2. L. 2. *de temp. nov.* c. 15. min adds that *it is certain that it will be so.* To the ſame purpoſe ſpeak *Stapleton*, *Acoſta*, with divers others. And all this they ground upon thoſe paſſages of the Revelation which ſeem very concluding to this ſenſe, and clearly to intend it, as *the ſlaughter of the two witneſſes*, by whom the *Orthodox* members of the Church is underſtood, the flight of the *woman*, that is the *Church*, into the *Deſert*, and the worſhip which the whole world will then pay to the Beaſt. Where note that theſe *Witneſſes*, which repreſent the Church, are but two, and they at laſt are *ſlain*, and that the Dominion of *Antichriſt* is *over all Kingdoms, Tongues and Nations*, and he is ſaid *to cauſe the earth and him that dwelleth therein to worſhip him, and both ſmall and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive his mark.* All which ſeemeth to ſignifie as much as the teſtimonies forecited. Now ſeeing it is Propheſied concerning *Antichriſt*, *that he ſhould exalt himſelf above all that is called God*, and of the people of thoſe *Antichriſtian* times, *that they ſhould worſhip Devils*, and *Idols of Gold and Silver, and of Braſs and Stone, and of Wood which can neither ſee nor hear nor walk, and that the earth and they that dwell therein ſhould become worſhippers of the Beaſt, and of his Image*, therefore it muſt be alſo *Propheſied* that *Idolatry* ſhould reign, and ſpread it ſelf over the *Chriſtian World.*

Rev. xiii. 7, 16.

Τὸ δὲ ὅλη ἡ γῆ ὀπίσω τοῦ θηρίου. Aret. in locum.

Rev. ix. 20.

Rev. xiii. 12.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

The Contents.

Ob. 3. *That if the Church be guilty of Idolatry, the Gates of Hell would have prevailed againſt her, Anſwered by ſhewing that by this phraſe,* the Gates of Hell, *errors in Doctrine or Corruption in manners cannot be underſtood, but only the ſtate of death.* §. I. *Ob.* 4. *That if the Church be Idolatrous ſhe cannot be Holy, Anſwered by ſhewing what is the Holineſs of the Church viſible.* §. II. *Ob.* 5. *We grant the Papiſts may be ſaved and conſequently muſt grant they are not guilty of Idolatry, Anſwered* (1.) *by ſhewing that moderate Papiſts grant that Proteſtants may be ſaved, whom yet they charge with Hereſie, and Schiſm, and ſuch like damning ſins.* §. III. (2.) *That their Repentance for their unknown ſins, and conſequently their unknown Idolatries, may obtain mercy for thoſe who wanted means of better information.* §. IV. (3.) *That in the ſame circumſtances we believe that Idolaters may be ſaved.* ibid. *Ob.* 6. *The Church of* Rome *cannot be guilty of Idolatry becauſe we do acknowledg her to be a true Church, Anſwered* (1.) *By ſhewing that true Church may ſtill continue ſo to be when it is guilty of Idolatry.* §. V. (2.) *That the Church of* Rome *may be a true Church in that large ſenſe in which the Proteſtants confeſs ſhe is ſo, and yet be guilty of Idolatry; they only ſaying that ſhe is a true viſible Church in that ſenſe in which Heretical and Idolatrous Churches*

may be ſo. §. VI. *To admit the Church of* Rome *to be in this ſenſe a true viſible Church is ſufficient to juſtifie the Ordination and Succeſſion of our Clergy.* (1.) *Becauſe the Ordination of Hereticks is valid.* §. VII. *And ſo is alſo the Ordination of Idolaters.* §. VIII. *Some of our Divines acknowledg that in the Church of* Rome, *when* Luther *firſt begun his Reformation, there was a ſaving profeſſion of the truth of Chriſt.* §. IX. *This acknowledgment is explained, and the inference thence made, that the Church of* Rome *was not then Idolatrous, though Idolatry prevailed much in it.* ibid. *Ob.* 7. *That if the Church of* Rome *be truly charged with this crime, ſhe muſt be guilty of Heatheniſh Idolatry, anſwered by ſhewing that ſhe is ſo only in that ſenſe in which all Idolatry may be ſtiled Heatheniſh.* §. X. *And* (2.) *by divers inſtances of ſuch Idolatry, which in the judgment of the Romaniſts themſelves, is not excluſive of ſalvation.* ibid.

§. I. Ob. 3. P. 125.

AND this is all that is needful to be ſaid in anſwer to this Argument. But yet *ex abundanti* I will add ſome remarks upon thoſe Arguments which *T. G.* and *R. H.* do further offer to demonſtrate (1.) That the whole Church of Chriſt cannot be guilty of Idolatry, which is the minor propoſition of this objection. And firſt, *T. G.* thus Argues, that if the Church, which is Chriſts Kingdom, could Apoſtatize ſo far as to enjoyn and allow the belief and practice of Idolatry, *the Gates of Hell would have prevailed againſt it*, but the Gates of Hell cannot prevail againſt it. *Ergo.*

Theſe

These words, *the Gates of Hell*, do not contain a promise of preservation of the Church from sin, or error of what kind soever, but only signifie that all true *Christians* who die in the Lord, shall be delivered from death, and shall obtain a joyful Resurrection; For *the Gates of Hell* in Scripture phrase do never signifie the power of *Heresie*, or *Satan*, sin, or error, but both in the Old *Testament*, the *Jewish* writers, and the Antient *Heathens*, it constantly is used to signifie the state of death, as will be evident to any person who consults the places cited in the *Synopsis*, and doth with them compare the passages in which this phrase is used in the Old Testament, and in the *Jewish* writers. *I said*, saith *Hezekiah*, *in the cutting off of my days* πορεύσομαι ἐν πύλαις ᾅδου, *I shall go to the Gates of Hell, I am deprived of the residue of my years*, and what is in the Hebrew שערי מות *the Gates of death*, is by the Septuagint Translated πυλωροὶ ᾅδου *the Gates of Hell*, Job xxxviii. 17. *Thou hast the power of life and death*, saith the Author of the Book of Wisdom, κατάγεις εἰς πύλας ᾅδου καὶ ἀνάγεις, *thou bringest down to the Gates of Hell and raisest up again: They cryed to the Lord to have mercy on them now being even at the point of death*, πρὸς πύλαις ᾅδου, at the Gates of Hell: Nor did *Eusebius* doubt the truth of this exposition of the words, for he declares *that God had hereby promised that the Church should not be overcome by death*, and that by virtue of this one voice, *Upon this rock will I build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against her*, the Church continues not subdued by her enemies, *nor yielding to the Gates of death.* (2) This Scripture may concern the Church consi-

Answ.

Es. xxxviii. 10.

Chap. xvi. 13. Mac. v. 37. Τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μηδεπώποτε ὑπὸ θανάτου νικήσεσθαι. Præpar. Ev. l. 1. c. 3. p. 7. D.

Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ταῖς τοῦ θανάτου πύλαις ὑποχωρῆσα. p. 8. C.

Eccleſia in iis eſt qui ædificant ſupra petram, i. e. qui audiunt verba Chriſti & faciunt. Aug. de unit. Eccl. c. 16. c. 18. *De* Bapt. l. 6. c. 3. 24. Contr. Don. l. 3. c. 18. Orig. *in* Matt. Hom. 1.

conſidered as inviſible, not as viſible, for, as the *Fathers* ſay, it concerns thoſe only which are built upon the *Rock*, and ſuch are only they who hear the words of Chriſt, and do them. Now as in the defection of the Church of *Iſrael* to Idol Worſhip, 7000 ſouls remained who had not bowed the knee to *Baal*, ſo may it be in the defection of the Church viſible into the like ſin.

Ob. 4. §. II. Diſc. p. 75.

But ſaith *R. H. of the Catholick Church*, *we ſay in our Creed I believe one Holy Catholick Church, but how is it Holy if it may fall into, and teach ſo groſs and ſo manifold Idolatry?*

Anſw.

Even as the Church of *Iſrael* and *Judah* was Holy, notwithſtanding their *Idolatry* and wickedneſs, and the City of *Jeruſalem* was *Holy*, notwithſtanding the wickedneſs of the people that lived in it, the Church is therefore always Holy, ſaith the Reverend and Learned *Biſhop Pearſon*, 1. 'In reference to the vocation by 'which all the members of it are called, and ſe-'parated from the reſt of the world to God, 'which ſeparation in the Language of the Scri-'ptures is a ſanctification, and ſo the calling be-'ing Holy, *for God hath called us with an holy* '*calling*, the body which is ſeparated by it may 'well be called Holy. 2. In relation to the Of-'fices appointed, and the powers exerciſed in 'the Church, which by their inſtitution and ope-'ration are holy, and ſo that Church for which 'they were appointed, and in which they are ex-'erciſed may be called Holy. 3. Becauſe whoſo-'ever is called to profeſs Faith in Chriſt, is there-'by engaged to Holineſs of life, according to the 'words of the *Apoſtle*, *let every man that nameth* 'the

Expoſ. on the Creed. p. 343.

2 Tim. i. 9.

'*the name of Christ depart from iniquity.* 4. The '*Church* is stiled Holy because the end of consti-'tuting a Church in God, was for the purchasing 'a Holy people, and the great design of it was 'for the begetting and increasing Holyness, that 'as God is originally Holy in himself, so he might 'communicate his sanctity to the Sons of men, 'whom he intended to bring to the fruition of 'himself, to which without a previous Sanctifi-'cation they cannot approach, because *without* '*Holiness no man shall see the Lord.* But as for real inward Holiness, either it is necessary to constitute a member of the visible Church, or it is not, if it be not, then can it not be necessary to constitute any part of the whole Church visible, and consequently it is not necessary to constitute the whole, and so it is not necessary to believe that the *Catholick visible Church* is thus Holy; if it be said that this inward Holiness is necessary to make a member of the *visible Church*, then are none to be reckoned, or approved of as members of the *Church visible*, who are not inwardly Holy, nor is a wicked *Bishop* or *Church-Governor*, to be obeyed, because such are not members of the *Church*, and are without the *Church*, and therefore have no right to Govern these within.

2. Seeing I can have no assurance that any members of a *Council* are inwardly Sanctified, it follows that I can have no assurance of the truth of their definitions, because I can have no assurance that they are members of the Church to which the promise of Divine assistance is confined, unless perhaps *R. H.* will say that the acceptation of their definitions is an evidence of the Sanctification of the *Major part* of the *Council*, which he may say with as much reason as that

Disc. 3. ch. 10. §. 115.

that it is an evidence that they were truly Ordained and Baptized.

Ob. 5. §. III. Moreover it is objected that *Proteſtants* confeſs that *Papiſts* may be ſaved, from which confeſſion it will follow that they are not *Idolaters*, becauſe the Scriptures frequently declare that no *Idolater* can be ſaved: *Idolatry*, ſaith *R. H. is an error which excludes from ſalvation, for it muſt needs be a mortal ſin, and ſo unacknowledged and unrepented of, it muſt not only hazard, but deſtroy ſalvation.*

P. 75.

Anſw. To this objection we anſwer, 1. By retortion, thus it is confeſſed by *Papiſts* that *Proteſtants* may be ſaved, from which confeſſion it will follow that they are not guilty either of *Hereſie* or *Schiſm*, becauſe the Scripture hath declared concerning theſe offences, that *they who do ſuch things ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God*, that *Proteſtants* may be ſaved, is confeſſed implicitely and conſequentially, 1. By thoſe who do aſſert that even an *Heretick*, whilſt he conceiveth his own Sect more credible, is not obliged to believe, becauſe the Faith is not ſufficiently propounded to him, for if he be not obliged to believe, he cannot ſure be damned for not believing what the Church propoſeth. 2. That they are to be excuſed who labor under the want of Teachers. 3. That they do, many of them, labor under that ignorance which is invincible, and therefore doth excuſe from ſin, it is confeſſed more expreſly by many ſober *Papiſts*, for Mr. *Creſſy* hath declared in behalf of all his Brethren, that 'Catholicks will 'not doubt to ſay that to many thouſands of our 'Religion, neither their *Hereſie*, nor their *Schiſm* 'ſhall prove *de facto* damnable, but that, ſuppoſing they die with an intention to renounce 'what-

Gal. v. 21.

Vide St. Clar. Problem. 15.

Exomol. p. 546. Ed. Par. 1647.

'whatſoever of their opinions ſhould appear to 'them to have been erroneous, their invincible ig-'norance *N. B.* cauſed by Education, miſinfor-'mation of Catholick Doctrines, *&c.* may pro-'bably find pardon from our merciful judg. The incomparable *Chillingworth* concludes, from the Conceſſions of Mr. *Knot*, that whatſoever *Proteſtant* wanteth capacity, or having it, wanteth ſufficient means of inſtruction to convince his Conſcience of the falſhood of his own, and the truth of the *Roman Religion*, may be ſaved notwithſtanding any error in his Religion; which is indeed the concluſion of Mr. *Knots* diſcourſe in theſe words, *thus we allow Proteſtants as much Charity as* Dr. *Potter ſpares us, for whom he makes ignorance the beſt hopes of ſalvation*; 2. That nothing hinders but that a *Proteſtant* dying a *Proteſtant* may die with contrition for his *Schiſm* and *Hereſie*, and doing ſo may be ſaved, for ſaith Mr. *Knot*, when *the man that is eſteemed a Proteſtant dyeth, we do not inſtantly conclude him in Hell, becauſe we know not what light might have cleared his errors, or what contrition retracted his ſins.* And this is ſutable to the determination of many *Roman Catholicks*, that Chriſtians may be abſolved who are ignorant of that which under pain of mortal ſin they are obliged to know, becauſe they may be contrite for their ignorance and be deſirous to learn. *Sancta Clara* ſpeaking of our *Engliſh Proteſtants*, ſaith thus. 'I wholly judg many 'of them free from all crime, and that if, after Bap-'tiſm received, they exert acts of contrition, they 'may be ſaved, and I piouſly hope many of them 'are thus actually ſaved, and this I judg to be the 'more common ſentence of the *Doctors*, becauſe 'it is commonly ſo Preached in their Churches.

Ch. 1. Part. 1. S. 4.

Prob. 15. p. 97.

More-

Moreover *R. H.* himſelf cannot be ignorant that it doth paſs for current Doctrine in their *Schools*, that *ignorant perſons may innocently be Hereticks*, *when they are by their Prieſts miſled into the groſſeſt Hereſies*; *that Lay-men erring with their Teachers, are by the common Doctrine of the Schools and Doctors wholly excuſed from all fault. That all the ſeven Capital ſins by reaſon of the imperfection of the act, or other circumſtances* may become only venial; *that ignorance invincible excuſes from ſin, and that there may be ignorance invincible even of the things commanded or forbidden by the law of nature or the Decalog*, and therefore of the *Idolatry* forbidden in that *Decalog*; how can he then pronounce ſo decretorily againſt the Church of *Rome*, that no Salvation could be had by any of her members, provided they were guilty of *Idolatry*, without a contradiction to theſe avowed Tenets of the moſt famous *Doctors* of the *Church* of *Rome*? And whereas the Biſhop of *Chalcedon* ſaith, that Proteſtants 'do allow Salvation to the *Roman* Church, and 'to formal Papiſts; but *Roman* Catholicks do deny 'ſaving Faith and Salvation to the Proteſtant 'Church, and to formal Proteſtants, and grant 'it only to ſuch Proteſtants as are invincibly ignorant of their errors, who are not formal Proteſtants, but rather *Proteſtantibus credentes*, perſons deceived by giving two much truſt to Proteſtants: Biſhop *Bramhal* anſwers, that we ſay the very ſame, *viz.* that we allow not ſaving Faith or Salvation to formal Papiſts, but to ſuch as err invincibly, and are prepared in their minds to receive the truth, when God ſhall reveal it. Such are not formal Papiſts, but *Papiſtis credentes*, ſuch as give too much truſt to Papiſts.

S. Clar. Prob. 15. p. 99.

Idem Ibid.

Eſtius in Sent. l. 2. diſt. 42. §. 7.

Reply Chap. 6. §. p. 224. Ed. Dublin, 1677.

2. To

§. IV.

2. To this enquiry, how can *Idolaters* living and dying ſo without repentance, as the *Papiſts* do, be ſaved? It is excellently anſwered by the Reverend and learned Biſhop *Sanderſon*, in theſe words, 'I do not ſo excuſe the *Idolatry* of our '*Forefathers*, as if it were not in it ſelf a ſin, and 'that without repentance damnable, but yet their 'ignorance being ſuch as it was, nouriſhed by 'education, cuſtom, tradition, the tyranny of 'their leaders, the faſhion of the times, not with-'out ſome ſhew alſo of piety and devotion, and 'themſelves withall having ſuch ſlender means 'of better knowledge; though this cannot excuſe 'them from ſin without repentance damnable, 'yet it much leſſeneth, and qualifies the ſinfulneſs 'of their *Idolatry*, arguing that their continuance 'in it was more from other prejudices, than from 'a wilful contempt of Gods Holy Word and will, 'and as for their repentance it is as certain that 'as many of them as are ſaved do repent of their '*Idolatries*, as it is certain no *Idolater*, nor other 'ſinner can be ſaved without repentance. But 'then there is a double difference to be obſer-'ved between repentance for ignorances, and 'for known ſins, the one is that known ſins muſt 'be confeſſed and repented of, and pardon asked 'for them in particular, that is, where God al-'loweth time and capacity, every kind of them 'muſt be particularly confeſſed; whereas for ig-'norances it is ſufficient to wrap them up all to-'gether in a general and implicit confeſſion, and 'crave pardon for them in the lump, as *David* 'doth in Pſalm xix. ſaying, *Lord cleanſe me from* '*my ſecret ſins*. The other difference is this, that 'known ſins are not truly repented of but where 'they are forſaken; But ignorances may be care-

Serm. 6. ad Pop. Part 1. p. 335, 336, 337.

fully

'fully repented of, and yet ſtill continued in. 'The reaſon is, becauſe they may be repented 'of in the General, without ſpecial knowledge 'that they are ſins, whereas without ſuch ſpecial 'knowledge they cannot be reformed. Some of 'our *Forefathers* then might not only live in *Po-*'*piſh Idolatry*, but even die in an *Idolatrous* act, 'and yet have truly repented (though but in the 'General, and in the croud of their unknown 'ſins) even of thoſe very ſins, and have at the 'ſame inſtant true Faith in *Jeſus Chriſt*, and other 'Graces accompanying Salvation. Now from 'theſe anſwers it is evident,

1. That we only grant that *Papiſts* may be ſaved in ſuch circumſtances in which we do believe *Idolaters* may be ſaved alſo. For, as the *Roman Caſuiſts* conclude, that albeit the Scripture ſaith *no fornicator ſhall be ſaved*, yet doth not this conclude againſt thoſe perſons who are deceived with a *Leah* inſtead of *Rachel*, as good *Jacob* was; and albeit the *drunkard* be excluded by the ſame Scripture from Salvation, yet will not this condemn a holy *Noah*, who knew not that the wine he drank would have ſuch ill effect upon him; and albeit the Scriptures ſay *no Murtherer ſhall have eternal life*, yet will not that conclude againſt thoſe perſons who in ſimplicity of heart do ſerve their *Prince* in an unlawful war; ſo neither will thoſe Scriptures which ſay *no Idolater ſhall have eternal life*, exclude the perſon who through like ignorance of fact, or right, commits *Idolatry*. And thus '[a] in all theſe paſſages 'of Scripture, ſaith *Eſtius*, which in the general 'make the effect of ſin excluſion from Chriſts 'Kingdom, deſtruction and eternal death, or 'in particular do reckon certain kinds of ſins amongſt

[a] *Quæ omnia non niſi ſecundum quandam peccati perfectionem accipi debent, cum alloqui conſtet etiam ex ipsâ Scriptura in his peccatorum Generibus delinqui poſſe venialiter.* Eſtius *in* Sent. l. 2. diſt. 42. §. 4.

'amongſt thoſe works of the fleſh which exclude 'from Heaven, in all theſe paſſages, ſaith he, we 'are to underſtand the Scriptures only to ſpeak 'of ſins in general, or of thoſe kinds of ſins *ſecun-* '*dum quandam peccati perfectionem*, i. e. *when they* '*are knowingly committed, and perſiſted in*, and 'when they are not any way retracted by Repen- 'tance; for otherwiſe it is clear even from Scri- 'pture, that in committing of theſe kind of ſins 'men may be only guilty of a venial fault.

2. Hence it appears that the Charity we exerciſe towards the Church of *Rome* in this particular, is only that Charity which they themſelves have taught us, and which they exerciſe to others in like circumſtances, when they pronounce them guilty of ſins in their own nature damnable, and that it is not any neceſſity which lies upon us ſo to do, as *R. H.* wrongfully ſuggeſts, but it is only love of truth, and evidence of reaſon, which is the ground of this our Charity. We being fully ſatisfied that the God of mercy will not condemn the perſon who ſincerely doth Repent of all his unknown treſpaſſes, by reaſon of thoſe errors of his underſtanding which he was not able to correct, or which in his unhappy circumſtances, he hardly could diſcover to be errors. Diſc. p. 78.

3. I anſwer, that if the defect of a particular Repentance for, or an acknowledgment of every mortal ſin committed by a Chriſtian, will certainly obſtruct the poſſibility of his Salvation, then the Salvation of a Papiſt muſt be exceeding hazardous upon their own avowed Principles, for it is evident beyond denial, and proved by a late Author, that *Roman Caſuiſts* do teach, that Murther, Fornication, Uncleanneſs, Adultery, Theft, Lying, Anger, Revenge, Reviling, Drunken- The Practical Divinity of Papiſts, &c.

neſs, and Covetouſneſs, which is *Idolatry*, and all thoſe ſins which by the Scriptures are pronounced mortal, and ſo excluſive of the ſoul from Heaven, are either in ſome caſes, which may often happen, none at all, or only venial ſins; 'tis alſo certain that theſe *Caſuiſts* are often ſubject to very groſs miſtakes in paſſing this determination, when a ſin is *venial*, and when 'tis *mortal*, and very often contradict each the other, nay ſome of them confeſs they are not able, after all their ſtudy, to lay down any certain rules in this particular. If then the Lay-man being deceived by his *Prieſt* judge that to be only a venial ſin, which in reality is mortal, he being alſo taught by the *Trent Council*, and his *Roman Doctors*, that he may without fault, conceal a venial ſin, and not at all confeſs it, he according to the Doctrine of *R. H.* muſt be condemned to eternal miſery, for following the judgment of his blind miſtaken Prieſt.

v. Eſtium. Ibid. *Nam venialia quibus à Gratiâ dei non excludimur, tacere citra culpam poſſunt.* Seſſ. 14. c. 5.

Ob. 6. §. V. R. H. Diſc. p. 78. It is objected that a *true Church*, whilſt it continues ſo to be, cannot be guilty of *Idolatry*, ſince therefore we acknowledg the Church of *Rome* to be, and to continue a *true Church*: we cannot truly ſay that ſhe is guilty of *Idolatry*.

Anſw. Anſw. to Sev. Treat. Part. 1. p. 20. It is already truly anſwered by the Reverend and Learned Dr. *Stilling fleet*, that 'this objection 'is very diſingenuous, becauſe it doth not anſwer any of thoſe Arguments which we have 'uſed to prove the Church of *Rome* Idolatrous, but 'only doth oppoſe the judgment of Charity to 'that of Reaſon, which doth engage us to conclude they are *Idolatrous*, and therefore to believe that, if Idolatry be not conſiſtent with the 'true being of a Church, we err in this our Charitable judgment, and therefore ſtand obliged to 'reverſe

'reverſe it. For inſtance, ſuppoſe one of the 'Church of *Judah*, ſhould have called the 'Church of *Iſrael*, in the time of *Jeroboam* a '*true Church*, becauſe they did acknowledg the 'true God, and did admit the Law of *Moſes* in all 'other matters; and did believe the acknowledg-'ment of thoſe truths to be ſufficient to preſerve 'the eſſentials of a Church among them, and af-'terwards the ſame perſon ſhould endeavour to 'convince the *Ten Tribes* of their *Idolatry* in wor-'ſhipping God by the *Calves* of *Dan* and *Bethel*; 'would this be thought a ſufficient way of an-'ſwering him to ſay, that he contradicted himſelf 'by granting them a *true Church*, and yet char-'ging them with *Idolatry*! No, the true conſe-'quence would be that he thought ſome kind of '*Idolatry* conſiſtent with the being of a Church, 'and if this were not ſo, his Charity muſt be 'miſtaken, provided that his reaſon could not 'be gainſayed.

2. That a true Church may yet continue ſo to be when it is guilty of *Idolatry*, may be made evident from the conſideration of the *Jewiſh Church*. For firſt, that the whole Church was guilty of *Idolatry* in worſhipping the golden *Calf* the *Romaniſts* do not deny; the Scriptures having clearly ſaid, that by ſo doing they *changed the image of the incorruptible God into the ſimilitude of a Calf*. *Pſ.* cvi. 19, 20. That they who worſhipped the Calf *did offer Sacrifice to an Idol*, *Acts* vii. 41. and more expreſly that they were *Idolatrous*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 7. 2. That notwithſtanding this *Idolatry*, they ſtill continued to be Gods Church and People, if he had then a Church on earth, is evident, and therefore Verſe 14. it is ſaid that *God repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people*.

Moreover that the worſhip of the Calves which *Jeroboam* had ſet up in *Dan* and *Bethel* was *Idolatry*, is evident from theſe conſiderations, 1. That it was a worſhip like to that of the *Golden Calf*, which we have proved to be *Idolatrous*. 2. God ſo eſteemed this action, for thus he ſpeaks to *Jeroboam*, *Thou haſt done evil above all that were before thee, for thou haſt gone and made thee other Gods and molten Images to provoke me to anger.* 3. Theſe Calves are by the Scripture called *Idols*, *Hoſ.* viii. 4, 5.

1 King. xiv. 9.

2. That even from the time of *Jeroboam* to the Captivity of *Iſrael* the worſhip of the *Calves* was the Eſtabliſhed Religion of the Ten Tribes. For, from the time of *Jeroboam* even to the days of *Hoſea*, that is, the time when *Iſrael* was carried away into *Aſſyria*, we find not any King of *Iſrael* who Reigned above one Month, of whom it is not ſaid expreſly that *he walked in all the ways of* Jeroboam *the ſon of* Nebat, *and in his ſin wherewith he made* Iſrael *to ſin.* Moreover it is ſaid expreſly that when once *Jeroboam* had prevailed with *Iſrael* to commit that *great ſin* of worſhipping the *Calves* of *Dan* and *Bethel*, *the Children of* Iſrael *walked in all the ſins of* Jeroboam *which he did, they departed not from them, till the Lord removed* Iſrael *out of his ſight.* Whence it muſt neceſſarily follow that from the days of *Jeroboam* to the Reign of *Hoſea*, the Church of *Iſrael* continued in her *Idolatry*.

3. That God during that time, or at the leaſt ſome portion of it, did ſtill eſteem and own them as his Church and people; for *Jehu* was by a *Prophet* of the Lord Anointed *King* over *the people of the Lord*, N. B. *even over* Iſrael. 2 *Kings* ix. 6. *Iſrael* was therefore then the people of the Lord, though

though they continued in the ſins of *Jeroboam*, as alſo *Jehu* did, 2 *Kings* x. 29. 2. In the days of *Jehoahaz* it is Recorded that *the Children of* Iſrael *departed not from the ſins of* Jeroboam, *who made* Iſrael *to ſin, but walked in them*, and yet it is Recorded alſo that then *the Lord was gracious to them, and had compaſſion on them, and reſpect to his Covenant with* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob, *and would not deſtroy them, nor caſt them from his preſence as yet.* Now his Covenant with *Abraham, Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, was this, *that he would be their God, and the God of their ſeed after them*; to have reſpect to this Covenant, muſt therefore be to continue ſtill to be *their God*, and own them for his *people*. 3. They with whom God was preſent, amongſt whom he walked, in the midſt of whom he dwelt, and with whom he was a God in Covenant, were ſtill his Church and People; and he was ſtill their God, according to his promiſe, Lev. xxvi. 11, 12. *I will ſet my Tabernacle amongſt you, and will walk among you, and you ſhall be my people, and I will be your God.* And indeed God in Scripture is ſaid to walk among them by his gracious *preſence in his Tabernacle*, he dwelt among them by dwelling at *Jeruſalem*, in that *Temple* and that *City*, or by continuing his ſpecial preſence there, and upon this account in Scripture the *Temple* is oft ſtiled *his dwelling place*. Now even in the times of the *Idolatry* of *Iſrael*, and *Judah*, God ſtill was preſent with them, he walked and dwelt among them, and was their God in Covenant, he, I ſay, was ſtill graciouſly preſent with, he walked and dwelt among them, for yet he had not caſt them from his preſence, he was ſtill *the holy one in the midſt of* Ephraim, he was not yet departed from them

2 King. xiii. 6.
2 King xiii. 23.
2 Sam. vii. 6.
1 Chron. xvii. 5.
Pſal. ix. 11. cxxxv. 21.
Eſ. xviii. 4.
Joel iii. 21.
2 Chr. vi. 2. xxxvi. 15.
Pſal. lxxiv. 7. lxxvi. 2. lxxix. 7.
Eſ. xviii. 4.
Joel iii. 17.
2 King. xiii. 23.
Hoſ. xi. 9.

them, for he by way of commination saith *Wo unto*
Hos. ix. 12. *them, when I shall depart from them.* After that they had even broken God with their whorish hearts which had departed from him, and with their eyes which went a whoring after their *Idols*, yet the glory of the Lord was not departed from the Sanctuary, but still appeared in the
Ezek. vi. 9, 13. *Temple*, and between the *Cherubims*, they after
Ezek. ix. 3, 4. this *bare sons and daughters unto God.* Moreover
x. 3, 4. that he was still their God in Covenant, appears
xviii. 19. from those expressions of the *Prophets*, when
Ezek. xvi. 20. pleading in behalf of this backsliding people, they speak thus: *Break not thy Covenant with us,*
Jer. xiv. 21. *thou art our Father, we are all thy people; turn O*
Es. lxiv. 8, 9. *backsliding Children, for I am married to you*, and
Jer. iii. 14. from innumerable places, in which he owns them for his *people* still, and is not yet ashamed to be called their God.

This will be farther evident from the New Testament, for in the Church of *Corinth* there were many of the strongest Christians, who being in their Consciences convinced that *an Idol was nothing*, and so could have no power to defile the meat which had been offered to it; did upon this presumption sit down with others in the *Idol Temples*, and eat and drink that which they knew was offered to the *Idol.* This the *Apostle* plainly tells them was *Idolatry*, that it was in
1 Cor. x. 7, 11, effect to have communion with *Devils*, to drink
20, 21. the cup of *Devils*, and to be partakers of the table of *Devils*, and yet he clearly doth insinuate that they who through that error or mistake, were guilty of this *Idol worship*, might still remain his *Christian brethren and beloved.*

More-

Moreover that *Babylon* was the Mother of Harlots and Abominations, that ſhe commanded all her ſubjects to commit ſpiritual Fornication or *Idolatry*, St. *John* doth frequently inform us; and yet that even here *God had his Church and People*, is evident from that voice from Heaven ſaying, *Come out of her my people*, for how could God have ſaid, *Come out of her my people*, had he not then preſerved alive within this Throne of *Satan*, a people to himſelf? Laſtly the *Jewiſh Synagog* in the days of our Saviour *Chriſt*, had taken away the *Key of knowledg*, *they neither entered themſelves into his Kingdom*, who were the keepers of that key, nor *ſuffered others* ſo to do. That little knowledg which remained among them was damnably corrupted, not only with the *Saducean Hereſie*, which mightily prevailed amongſt the wealthieſt of them, but alſo with the leaven of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, who had by their Traditions *made void the Law of God*, and rendered *his worſhip vain*; theſe *Scribes* and *Phariſees* are by the *Baptiſt* ſtyled *a Generation of Vipers*, by Chriſt *Blind fooliſh Hypocrites*, perſons that *could not ſcape the damnation of Hell*. Of the whole people Chriſt pronounceth that they were *of their father the Devil, and his works they would do*, and yet God had his Church even then among them, in which both *Zacharias*, *Elizabeth*, the *Virgin Mary*, *and our Lord* was born, of which both he, and his *Apoſtles* were then members, and into which they were admitted by Circumciſion. Their *Prieſts* were owned by our *Saviour* who ſent the *Lepers* to them, he acknowledged that theſe *Scribes* and *Phariſees ſtill ſat in* Moſes *Chair*, and that obedience was therefore due unto them in all lawful matters. Nor could

Rev. xviii. 4.

Luke xi. 52. Matt. xxiii. 13.

Matth. xv. 6, 9.

Matth. iii. 7. Matth. xxiii.

Joh. viii. 44.

Matth. viii. 4. Matth. xxiii. 2, 3.

it possibly be otherwise, seeing *Christs Church* and *Kingdom* was not begun till after his own Resurrection, nor do we read of any that were added to the *Church* till then.

Answ. §. VI. 3. That the Church of *Rome* may be a true visible Church in that sense in which our *English Protestants* confess she is so; i.e. *as having truth of visible existence, though not truth of doctrine*; and yet be guilty of *Idolatry*, will be apparent from these considerations,

1. That the notion of a visible Church which they lay down, as the true ground of this their Charitable judgment, containeth in it nothing inconsistent with the practice or allowance of *Idolatry*. For *to the visibility of a Church*, say they, *is only requisite an outward profession of those things which supernaturally appertain to the very essence of Christianity, and are necessarily required in every Christian man.* So the judicious Mr. *Hooker*.

Eccl. Pol. l. 3. §. 1. p. 126.

Now among the things which supernaturally appertain to the essence of *Christianity*, they do not reckon Moral Righteousness and Honesty of life, because although the want of these excludeth from Salvation, yet are they not of supernatural Revelation, but are discovered to us by the light of Nature; they are the duties as well of *Heathens*, as of *Christians*; and so concern us, saith Mr. *Hooker*, not as *Christians* only, but as men.

Hence they infer that every thing which excludeth from Salvation excludes not from the visible *Church*, this therefore cannot be, say they, essential to the being of a Church visible, that it doth hold or practise nothing which excludeth from Salvation. For instance, *Despair, want of Charity, secret Infidelity, the proud and envious spirit*, are all exclusive from Salvation; but none of

of them exclude a perſon who outwardly profeſſeth all the *eſſentials of Chriſtian Faith*, from being a true member of a Church viſible. Should we then grant that the *Idolatry* now practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, was totally excluſive of Salvation, it would not follow that ſhe did not continue a true viſible Church in the forementioned ſenſe. Agreeable to this we are told by *Zanchy*, *that in ſpight of* Satan *the Church of* Rome *retained ſtill the chief foundations of the Faith, though weakned with the Doctrines of men; it retained the publick Preaching of the word of God, though in many places miſunderſtood and miſconſtrued, the Invocation of the name of Chriſt, though joyned alſo with the Invocation of dead men, the adminiſtration of Baptiſm inſtituted by* Chriſt *himſelf, howſoever defiled with the addition of many ſuperſtitions, ſo as togegether with the* Symbol *of the* Covenant, *the* Covenant *it ſelf remained ſtill in her; the Church of* Rome *therefore is yet the Church of* Chriſt. *In the* Roman *Church, ſaith Dr.* Primroſe, *God doth ſtill keep his word in the Old and New Teſtament, as the contract of his* Marriage *with her, in her is the true* Creed, *the true* Decalog, *the true* Lords Prayer, *in her* Chriſt *is Preached, though corruptly, in her the* Trinity *and* Incarnation *of* Chriſt *are believed, in her the* Father, Son, *and* Holy Ghoſt, *are prayed to, though in an unknown tongue to the moſt part, in her the little* Children *are* Baptized *in the name of the* Father, Son, *and* Holy Ghoſt, *and no man will deny that their* Baptiſm *is a true Sacrament whereby their children are born to God, ſeeing we do not rebaptiſe them, when leaving them, they join to us: Who then can deny that ſhe is a true Church, ſeeing out of the true Church there is no Baptiſm, and the Church alone beareth Children to God?*

De Nat. dei Præfat. p.

Apud Biſhop *Hall*, To. 2. p. 94.

God? Now the belief of all these things here mentioned by Dr. *Primrose* and Mr. *Zanchy* are well consistent with the practice and allowance of *Idolatry*, and therefore in their judgments the truth of the visible Church may be consistent with it also.

2. They also add that a true visible Church may still continue so to be, even when she most deserves to be Divorced, provided God doth not give her *a Bill of Divorce*, remove her *Candlestick* or take away *the Kingdom of God from her.*

Lect. in Apoc. p. 430, 431. *Two things are requisite*, saith Episcopius, *to Unchurch a people*, 1. *That she merit a Divorce by reason of some deadly or fundamental error.* 2. *That God doth deal with her according to her merit by sending her a Bill of Divorce, both these are necessary to cause a Church to be so, for as a wife by being an Adultress doth not yet cease to be a wife, whilst her own husband will acknowledg her, and not Divorce her from him, so is it with the Church of God.* The Church of *Sardis* is by Christ owned as a Church, though as himself pronounceth, she only had a name to live, but really was dead. *The being of a Church*, saith Bishop Davenant, *doth principally stand upon the action of God calling men out of darkness and death, to the participation of light and life in* Christ Jesus, *so long as God continues this calling to a people, though they, as much as in them lies, darken this light, and corrupt the means which should bring them to Life and Salvation in Christ, yet where God calls men to the participation of life in Christ by the Word, and by the* Sacraments, *there is the true being of a Church, let men be never so false in the expositon of Gods word, or never so untrusty in mingling their own Traditions with Gods Ordinances. Thus the*

Ibid. p. 521. V. Hall, To. 2. Tr. of the Old Religion, p. 76.

Church

Church of the Jews *loſt not the being of a Church when ſhe became an* Idolatrous *Church. Thus to grant that the* Roman *was and is a true viſible Church, though in Doctrine a falſe, and in practice an Idolatrous Church is a true aſſertion, and of greater uſe and neceſſity in our Controverſie with* Papiſts *about the perpetuity of the Chriſtian Church, than is underſtood by thoſe that gainſay it.*

3. They ſay that a true viſible Church ceaſeth not to be ſo, though ſhe doth add to the profeſſion of thoſe eſſentials which conſtitute her a true viſible Church, ſuch tenets as by unſeen conſequence do overthrow ſome of them. *The* Church *of* Rome, ſaith Biſhop Hall, *profeſſing to hold thoſe things directly which by inferences ſhe cloſely overthrows, ſhe is a truly* viſible Church, *but an unſound one*: *Again the Church of* Rome, ſaith he, *under a* Chriſtian *face hath an* Unchriſtian *heart, overturning that foundation by neceſſary inferences which by open profeſſion it avows, that face, that profeſſion, thoſe avowed principles, are enough to give it claim to the true outward viſibility of a Chriſtian Church, nor can thoſe inferences Diſchurch it, whileſt thoſe main principles are kept alive in that crazy and corrupted body. And again* p. 63. *if we meaſure the true being of a viſible Church, by the direct maintaining of Fundamental Principles, though by conſequences indirectly overturned, and by the poſſeſſion of the word of God and his* Sacraments, *though not without foul adulteration*, what judicious Chriſtian *can deny* that the Church of *Rome* hath yet the true viſibility of a Church of Chriſt? *In reſpect of the common truths yet profeſſed among the* Papiſts, *they may*, ſaith *Dr.* Prideaux, *and ought to be termed a true viſible Church in oppoſition to* Jews, Turks, *and* Pagans, *who directly*

Advertiſ. p. 31.

Apud Biſhop *Hall*, To. 2. Part 2. p. 82.

rectly deny the foundation, howſoever their Antichriſtian *additions make them no better than the* Synagogue of Satan.

4. They, whilſt they do allow her to be a true *viſible Church*, do alſo ſay ſhe is *Heretical*, and do allow *Heretical* Churches to be true viſible Churches, alſo that which *Rome* holds with us makes it a Church, ſaith *Biſhop Hall*, that which it obtrudes upon us, makes it *Heretical*; and elſewhere to this queſtion, *is the Church of* Rome *ſtill a part of the truly exiſtent viſible Church of Chriſt?* He anſwers; *Surely no otherwiſe than an Heretical and Apoſtatical Church is, or may be. Their* Roman *Church, ſaith Dr.* Crakenthorp *is Heretical, yet muſt ſhe be accounted both, to be in the Church, and be a Church, not ſimply, not according to the integrity of Faith, not according to any inward virtue, not ſo effectually that it ſhould avail to Salvation for a man to be in it; but yet a Church it is in ſome reſpects, according to the external profeſſion of Faith, and of the word of God, according to the Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, according to ſome Doctrines of true belief, by which as by ſo many outward ligaments, ſhe is yet knit to the Orthodox and Catholick Church.* And to this Queſtion, *Is the* Roman *Church at this day no part of the Church of God?* our learned Dr. *Field* thus anſwers. *Surely as* Auſtin *noteth that the ſocieties of* Hereticks *in that they retain the profeſſion of many parts of heavenly truth, and the miniſtration of the Sacrament of* Baptiſm, *are ſo far joined with the* Catholick Church, *and the* Catholick Church, *in and by them bringeth forth children to God; ſo the preſent* Roman Church *is ſtill in ſome ſort a part of the* viſible Church *of God, but no otherwiſe than other*

Advertiſement. p. 51.

Reconciler, p. 61.

Defenſ. Eccl. Angl. adv. Spalat. c. 16.

Appen. part 3. p. 883.

other ſocieties of Hereticks *are, in that it retaineth the profeſſion of ſome parts of heavenly truth, and miniſtreth the true Sacrament of Baptiſm to the Salvation of the Souls of many thouſand Infants? We muſt acknowledg even Hereticks themſelves to be, though a maimed part, yet a part of the Church viſible, ſaith the judicious* Hooker, if the *Fathers* do any where, ſaith he, as oftentimes they do make the true Church of Chriſt, and her companies oppoſite, they are to be conſtrued as ſeparating *Hereticks*, not altogether from the company of Believers, but from the fellowſhip of *ſound Believers.* Eccl. Pol. l. 3. §. 1.

Laſtly, They alſo do aſſert that an *Idolatrous* Church may yet continue to be a true Church viſible. *Lo ſay the* Romaniſts, *we are of the true* viſible Church, *why then forſaken?* Anſ. *Alaſs poor ſouls,* ſaith Biſhop Hall, *do they not know that* Hypocrites, leud perſons, Reprobates, *are no leſs members of the viſible Church? what gain they by this but a deeper damnation? to what purpoſe did the* Jews *cry* the temple of the Lord, *whilſt they deſpighted the* Lord of that Temple? *They are of the viſible Church, but ſhamefully* Idolatrous *in practice. Our Saviour, ſaith Mr.* Hooker, *compareth the Kingdom of Heaven to a Net which gathereth together good Fiſh and bad, and to a Field where Tares, manifeſtly known and ſeen of all men, do grow intermingled with good Corn, and even ſo ſhall continue to the conſummation of the world. When the people of God worſhipped the* Calf *in the Wilderneſs, when they adored the* Brazen Serpent, *when they bowed the knee to* Baal, *and ſerved the Gods of the* Nations, *when they burnt Incenſe, and offered Sacrifice to* Idols, *true it is the wrath of God was moſt fiercely inflamed againſt them, and* Reconcil, p. 64, 65. ubi Supra.

they

they were forſaken of God in reſpect of that ſingular mercy wherewith he kindly embraceth his faithful children, howbeit retaining the Law of God, and the holy Seal of his Covenant, the ſheep of his viſible flock, they continued even in the depth of their diſobedience, and rebellion; wherefore among them God always had a Church not only becauſe he had thouſands who never bowed the knee to Baal, *but even they whoſe knees were bowed to* Baal, *were alſo of the viſible Church of God.* Of the ſame judgment are Biſhop *Davenant*, Dr. *Primroſe*, *Zanchy*, and *Epiſcopius*, in the fore-cited places.

§. VII. Now to admit the Church of *Rome* to be, *in the large ſenſe*, a true viſible Church of *Chriſt*, ſerves no deſigns of *Popery*, and is ſufficient to juſtifie the *Ordinations*, and ſucceſſion of the *Clergy* of the Church of *England*. For (1.) admit the firſt *Reformers* of our Church received their Ordination from thoſe *Biſhops* which were themſelves guilty of *Hereſie*, or *Schiſm*, or both, and therefore no true living Members of Chriſts body, nor any other ways to be reputed Members of the Church viſible than *Schiſmaticks* and *Hereticks* may be. This is abundantly ſufficient to juſtifie our *Ordination* and *Succeſſion*, and our entrance into the viſible Church by Baptiſm conferred by them. For of the Baptiſm of *Hereticks* without exception, and therefore of thoſe *Hereticks*, who by the judgment of the Univerſal Church have been eſteemed *Idolaters*, the Church of *Rome* in her *Trent Council* hath determined that it is valid, and hath pronounced an *Anathema*, on thoſe who ſay the contrary. *Jews*, *Hereticks*, and *Infidels*, may confer true Baptiſm, ſaith the *Roman Catechiſm*, as many *Antient Fathers*, and *Decrees of Council teach*, particularly the

Seſſ. 7. cap. de Bapt. Can. 4.

Part 2. Cap. 11. Sect. 24.

the General *Council* of *Constantinople*, and the sixth General *Council* held in *Trullo*, the *Council* held at *Florence*, and the *Lateran Council*.

Moreover that the Ordination of *Hereticks* is valid, the Learned Dr. *Stillingfleet* hath largely proved from the definition of the *Trent* Council, from the *Code* of Canons of the *African Church*, from the judgment of the second *Nicene Council*, from the General reception of this Doctrine in the *Roman Church*, for as *Morinus* witnesseth, *the opinion of the validity of Orders conferred by Hereticks hath only obtained in the* Roman *Church during the last four Centuries*, to which I add the definition of the first *Nicene* Council in the Case of the *Cathari*, or the *Novatian Hereticks*, *that they returning to the Catholick and Apostolick Church should remain in that Order of Clergy in which they were only receiving* χειροθεσίαν (or the imposition of hands for benediction and reconciliation) *and that if any of them were found either in Villages, or Cities, to be the only Bishops that were there Ordained, they should continue in that same rank.* Whereas concerning the *Pauliani*, who, as St. *Austin* thinks, *did not observe the essentials of true Baptism*, the *Council* doth determine that, *if any of them should be found among the Clergy, they should be Rebaptized, and then receive* χειροτονίαν *or Ordination by some Bishop of the Catholick Church*, so that the Ordination of the *Novatian Hereticks*, who were very numerous, and whose *Bishops* had continued in a long Succession at *Constantinople*, *Ephesus*, at *Cyzicum*, and in most other places, is by this great and holy *Synod* here pronounced valid, and they who were Ordained by their *Bishops* were not received into the *Church* as *Greeks*, or degraded into the

Preface to his Answer to several Treat. Sess. 7. Can. 9. 23. Can. 4. Cap. 68. Act. 1.

De Sacris Ord. Part 3. Exercit. 5. c. 1. n. 12.

Can. 8. Μήπως ἐπ' εὐλογίας ἐνταῦθα τὴν χειροθεσίαν λέγει καὶ οὐχὶ ἐπὶ χειροτονίας. Con. Nicen. 2. Act. 1. p. 68.

De Hæres. Cap. 44.

Can. 19.

Socrat. Hist. Eccles. l. 2. cap. 38. p. 144. l. 7. cap. 11.

the rank of Lay-men, whereas, by reaſon of ſome fundamental error in the caſe of *Baptiſm*, it is determined that the *Pauliani* who were of their *Clergy*, ſhould be by Baptiſm admitted firſt into the Church, and then by Ordination of the *Biſhop* into the number of the *Clergy*. The judgment of St. *Auſtin* is ſo clear in this point, that we need nothing more to evidence the Faith and practice which then obtained in the Church. For, that the Ordination of *Hereticks* is valid, he both aſſerts againſt the *Donatiſts*, and proves by theſe two mediums. 1. That *their Baptiſm being valid*, according to the determination of the Church; *their Ordination muſt be deemed ſo*; *there is no reaſon*, ſaith he, *that they who cannot loſe their Baptiſm ſhould loſe the power of giving Baptiſm to others, for they both of them are Sacraments, both of them are given by Conſecration, one when the perſon is Baptized, the other when he is Ordained, and therefore in the Catholick Church, it is not lawful to reiterate either of them.* 2. Becauſe, ſaith he, a perſon who, after his Ordination in the Church *Catholick*, becomes an *Heretick* muſt not at his return to the *Church* be Reordained, and therefore neither muſt he be Reordained who hath received Ordination out of the *Church Catholick*, *and hence it is*, ſaith he, *that if any Biſhops of the* Donatiſts *are won over to the Church, and it doth ſeem convenient that they ſhould bear the ſame Offices, which formerly they did, they are not by the Church Ordained, but at their Baptiſm, ſo their Ordination remains intire.* By this determination the Doctors of the *Roman Church* are generally ſwaied, ſo that *there is*, ſaith *Bellarmine*, *ſcarce any Catholick who knows not that they who are Baptized by Hereticks are*

Lib 2. *contra* Epiſt. Parm. c. 13.

Non ſunt rurſus ordinandi, ſed ſicut Baptiſmus in eis, ita Ordinatio manſit integra, qua in præciſione erat vitium, non in Sacramentis quæ ubicunque ſunt ipſa vera ſunt. Ibid.

Bell. l. 4. de Rom. Pontif. C. 10. § *at contra.*

Baptized

Baptized truly, and they that are Ordained by Hereticks are Ordained truly, when the Heretick that Ordains is truly a Biſhop, at leaſt, as to his Character.

§. VIII. 2. That the Ordination made by thoſe *Hereticks* who really were, or by the Church have been condemned as *Idolaters* or perſons guilty of more hainous crimes, when theſe Ordainers were true *Biſhops*, was eſteemed valid by the Church, the ſame Learned Perſon hath demonſtrated, 1. From the judgment of the ſecond *Nicene Council* in the Caſe of *Meletius*, who was ordained by *Arian* Biſhops, and whoſe Ordinations were accounted valid by an *Alexandrian Synod* in their *Synodal* Epiſtle, *which*, ſaith Petavius, *contains the faith received in the whole Church Catholick*, and in the *Synodal Epiſtle* of the firſt *Nicene Synod*, *which*, ſaith Petavius, *determined that they who were conſtituted and confirmed by myſtical impoſition of hands, ſhould be received into the Communion of the Church, and enjoy their functions with theſe proviſions, that they ſhould be in every* Church *and* Pariſh *after thoſe* Biſhops *and* Presbyters *which were ordained by* Alexander *Biſhop of* Alexandria, *that they ſhould have no power of electing whom they pleaſed, nor of propounding of the names of thoſe whom they thought fit to be choſen into the body of the* Clergy. 2. This he doth prove from a fuller teſtimony of the general ſenſe of the Church of that age, recorded by *Ruffinus* concerning the admiſſion of thoſe who had received orders from the *Arian* Biſhops to the exerciſe of their *Prieſtly* Office, with which decree of the *Alexandrian Council* about the receiving the *Arian Biſhops* and *Prieſts*, upon diſowning their *Hereſie*, though *Lucifer* did quarrel, yet *Jerom* ſaith *that*

Defence of his Diſcourſe. part 2. Chap. 4. p. 795, 798.

Eccleſ. Hier. l. 2. cap. 10. § 9

Idem App. To. 3. Eccl. Hier. l. 2. c. 3. § 4.

Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 1. c. 28.

Adv. Luciferi. init.

it was universally received by the Church: This will be farther evident from the 7. *Canon* of the second General Council of *Constantinople*, and from the 95. *Canon* of the *Synod* held at *Trullo*, in both which Canons it is determined that the *Arian* Baptism should be esteemed valid, and not to be reiterated, and therefore, as S. *Austin* doth infer, they must esteem their Ordination also valid and not to be reiterated. Because *in the Sacrament of Orders as well as Baptism*, saith the *Trent* Council, *an indelible Character is impressed*. Moreover,

That the Nestorians were *Idolaters* hath been declared by the Church, and yet their Ordination by the same Church hath been accounted valid, saith the second *Nicene Council*.

That the *Massaliani* or *Euchytæ* were worshippers of the Devil, *Epiphanius* doth inform us, and yet their Ordinations were allowed by the third General Council of *Ephesus*, and it was there decreed, saith the *Second Nicene Council*, that as many of their Clergy as would renounce their *Heresie* and return to the Church should remain in the number of the Clergy.

Concerning the *Heresie* of the *Iconoclasts*, it is determined by the members of the *Second Nicene Council*, that it is κακῶν κακίστη the worst of evils and of *Heresies*, *What shall we esteem them*, saith Tarusius, *who subvert Sacred Images? They must be counted*, saith the *Synod*, as *Atheists*, *Jews*, *and enemies of the truth*. They who reject them are like to *Jews* and *Samaritans*, saith the same *Synod*; and again *if the making of Images be likened to Idols, the mystery of our redemption is made void*, saith the same Council: and yet this very *Council* doth determine that even these very persons who confessed *that they were born, and bred up in this*

Contra Epist. Parmen. lib. 2. c. 13. Sess. 23. c. 4. *Synod. Ephes. Epist. ad Theod. & Vale t. Imperat.* Act. Synod. cap. 7. *Audemus Anathematizare Nestorii Idololatriam in homine.* 2. *Nic. Concil.* Act. 7. Epist. ad Constantinum & Iren. Act. 1. p. 68. E. Hær. 80. n. 3. Μένειν τοὺς μὲν κληρικοὺς ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ. Io Act. 1. p. 72. E. Ἡ αἵρεσις, αὕτη χεῖρον πάντων τῶν αἱρέσεων κακόν. Act. 1. p. 77. E. Ὡς ἀθέους καὶ ἑβραίους καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκθρούς Act. 4. p. 236. A Act. 6. p. 357. B. Τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀπολυτρώσεως τὸ μυστήριον ματαιῶται. Act. 1. p. 77. C. Act. 3. p. 160. D. E.

this worſt of Hereſies, ſhould be admitted into the Order of Prieſthood which they had formerly received, and doth accordingly admit them.

Moreover from the *Trent Council* I thus argue, that power which is not Temporary, and therefore never can be taken away, continues with *Idolatrous Prieſts* and *Biſhops*, as well as with other *Hereticks*, but according to the definition of the *Trent Council*, *that power which is given in the Sacrament of Orders, impreſſing on the receiver an indelible Character never can be taken away*; For ſo they do expreſly teſtifie in theſe words. *Becauſe in the Sacrament of Order as well as Confirmation and Baptiſm a Character is impreſſed, which neither can be blotted out, nor taken away*, N. B. *This Holy Synod juſtly condemneth their opinion who hold that Prieſts of the New Teſtament have only a temporary power.* Laſtly, agreeable to this determination of the *Trent* Council is the determination of the Schools, for *that every Biſhop is a Miniſter of Sacred Orders is ſo true*, ſaith Eſtius, *that no Crime how enormous ſoever, as Hereſie, Schiſm, Apoſtacy, nor any cenſure how weighty ſoever, as* V.G. *that of Excommunication, can hinder the validity of any Ordination made by ſuch a perſon, even out of his own Juriſdiction, provided he obſerve the due rites of Ordination in things eſſential to that Sacrament. This doctrine*, ſaith he, *is ſufficiently confirmed by the continual practice of the Church, which never reordained any who returned from any Hereſie or Schiſm whatſoever in which they were ordained. Men*, ſaith Petavius, *may be deprived of the Communion of the* Church, *of all honour, dignity, function, and power eccleſiaſtical, as was the caſe of* Anthimus *the intruder into the See of* Conſtantinople, *and may be cenſured as unfit to be accounted* Chriſtians, *which*

In Sacramento ordinis Character imprimitur qui nec deleri nec auferri poteſt. Seſſ. 23. c. 4.

In Sent. l. 4. diſt. 25. §. 3.

De Eccl. Hier. l. 2. cap. 9. §. 2.

was the cenſure that Felix *the* Third, *and a* Roman Synod *paſt upon* Acacius, *but when the Church by proſcribing, and condemning them hath taken from them all it can, it cannot take away the power of Baptiſm and Ordination, and therefore the* Church Catholick *hath judged that they who were Baptiſed and Ordained by* Hereticks, *and* Schiſmaticks *have both true Baptiſm, and true Orders, and hath rejected thoſe that think otherwiſe as* Hereticks, *which both innumerable* Synods, *and* Orthodox Fathers among whom *Auſtin doth excel, have proved againſt the* Luciferians, *the* Donatiſts, *the* Arians, *and other* Peſts *of the* Church.

§. IX. There be ſome eminent *Divines* among us, who are, I hope not without reaſon, more candid in their apprehenſions of the *Roman Church* before the Reformation admitting it to have continued, when *Luther* and his friends began their *Reformation*, to have been a *Church*, in which Salvation might be had, not only for the ignorant, but alſo for many others who did not openly renounce Communion with her. 'That we 'yield no more to our *Adverſaries* now than for-
Appendix part 3. p. 880. 'merly we did, ſaith Dr. *Field*, in that we ac-'knowledge the *Latine* or *Weſtern Churches*, ſub-'ject to *Roman Tyranny*, before God raiſed up '*Luther*, to have been the true Churches of God '*in which a ſaving profeſſion of the truth of Chriſt* 'was found, and wherein *Luther* himſelf received 'his Chriſtianity, Ordination, and power of Mi-'niſtry; I will firſt ſhew that all our beſt, and moſt 'renowned *Divines* did ever acknowledg as much 'as I have written. Now that which doth induce them thus to judg, was the conſideration of theſe things.

1. That

1. That notwithſtanding thoſe very many and very grievous errors which then obtained too generally, and which were too much countenanced by the moſt powerful members of the *Roman Church*, there ſtill remained a profeſſion and acknowledgment of ſo much truth, as being joyned with Piety might be ſufficient to bring her members to eternal life. 'If at this day, 'ſaith *Biſhop Uſher*, we ſhould take a ſurvey of 'the ſeveral profeſſions of *Chriſtianity* that have 'any large ſpread in any part of the world, as 'of the Religion of the *Roman*, and the *Reformed Churches* in our quarters, of the *Ægyptians*, 'and *Æthiopians* in the South; of the *Græcians*, 'and other Churches in the *Eaſtern* parts, and 'ſhould put by the points wherein they dif- 'fer one from another, and gather into one bo- 'dy the reſt of the *Articles* wherein they all do 'generally agree, we ſhould find that in thoſe 'propoſitions, which without all controverſie 'are univerſally received in the whole Chriſtian 'world, ſo much truth is conteined, as being 'joyned with holy obedience may be ſufficient to 'bring a man to everlaſting Salvation; neither 'have we cauſe to doubt but that as many as do 'walk according to this rule (neither overthrow- 'ing that which they have builded up, by ſuper- 'inducing any *damnable Hereſies* thereupon, nor 'otherwiſe vitiating their holy Faith with a lewd 'and wicked converſation) peace ſhall be upon 'them and mercy. Which doctrine he confirms, 1. from the conſtant practice of the *Apoſtles* in their firſt receiving men into the ſociety of the Church. 'For, ſaith he, in one of the *Apoſtles* 'ordinary Sermons we ſee there was ſo much 'matter delivered as was ſufficient to convert

Sermon before his Majeſty at *Wanſted*. p. 28.

'men to the Faith, and make them capable of
'*Baptiſm*, and (yet) theſe Sermons treated only
'of the firſt principles of the Doctrine of Chriſt
'in theſe firſt principles, therefore muſt the foun-
'dation be contained, and that common unity
Ibid. p. 10. 'of Faith, which is required in all the members
'of the Church. Again p. 16. 'As there is a *com-*
'*mon Salvation*, ſo is there a *common Faith* which
'is alike precious in the higheſt *Apoſtle*, and
'the meaneſt believer, for we may not think that
'Heaven was prepared for *deep Clerks* only, and
'therefore beſides that larger meaſure of know-
'ledge whereof all are not capable, there muſt be
'*a rule of Faith* common to ſmall and great,
'which as it muſt conſiſt but of few propoſitions,
'for ſimple men cannot bear away many, ſo is it
'alſo requiſite that theſe *Articles* ſhould be of ſo
'much weight and moment, that they may be
'ſufficient to make a man wiſe unto Salvation.
'If then Salvation by believing theſe common
'principles may be had, and to Salvation none
'can come who is not firſt a member of the *Ca-*
'*tholick Church* of *Chriſt*, it followeth that the
'unity of Faith generally requiſite for the incor-
'porating of *Chriſtians* into that bleſſed *Society*,
P. 17. 'is not to be extended beyond theſe *common prin-*
'*ciples*. Which may farther be made manifeſt
'unto us by the continual practice of the *Catho-*
'*lick Church* herſelf in the *matriculation* of her
'*Children*, and firſt admittance of them into her
'Communion. For when ſhe prepared her *Ca-*
'*techumeni* for Baptiſm, and by that door received
'them into the congregation of *Chriſts Flock*, we
'may not think her judgment to have been ſo
'weak as to omit any thing herein that was eſſen-
'tially neceſſary for the making of one a member
'of

'of the Church. Now the profession which she 'required of all that were to receive Baptism was, 'for the *Agenda* or practical part, an abrenuntia- 'tion of the *Devil*, the *World*, and the *Flesh*, with 'all their sinful lusts, and works, and for the 'things to be believed, an acknowledgment of 'of the *Articles* of the Creed, which being per- 'formed solemnly, she then baptized them in this 'faith, intimating thereby sufficiently that this 'was that one faith commended to her by the 'Apostles, as the other that one *Baptism* which 'was appointed to be the *Sacrament* of it. And that the Creed of the *Apostles* as it is explained in the latter *Creeds* of the *Catholick Church*, was esteemed by the general suffrage of the *Greek* and *Latine Fathers*, and the whole *Antient Church*, a sufficient Summary, or Catalogue of fundamentals, that even by the *Trent* Council, the *Trent* Catechism, and the best learned *Romanists*, it is acknowledged so to be, is very largely and convincingly demonstrated by many eminent Writers of our Church.

Ibid. p. 17.

See *Potters* answer to *Charity Mistaken*, §. 7. from p. 216. to 233. Mr. *Chill.* c. 4. §. 83, 89. Bishop *Taylor*, disc. part. 2. l. 1. §. 4.

2. They add that those prevailing doctrines which thwarted the great fundamentals of our faith, and made salvation more difficult, were indeed doctrines strongly then prevailing in, but not received and owned as *Articles* of Faith by all the members of the Church of *Rome*. 'In 'the latter Ages before the Reformation, saith 'Dr. *Potter*, though the *Court* of *Rome* by cunning 'and violence had subdued many noble parts of 'Christendom under her yoke, yet the servitude of 'that *Church* and her misery was somewhat more 'supportable, because these base and pernicious 'adjections were not yet the *publick decisions* or 'tenets of any Church, but only the private con-

Answ. to *Charity Mistaken*. §. 3. p. 64, 65.

Of the Church, l. 3. chap. 8. p. 85.

'ceits of the *domineering Faction.* 'We moſt 'firmly believe, ſaith Dr. *Field*, all the Churches 'of the world wherein our Fathers lived and 'dyed to have been the true Churches of God 'in which undoutedly Salvation was to be found, 'and that they which taught, embraced and be-'lieved thoſe *damnable* errors which the *Roma-'niſts* now defend againſt us, were *a faction only 'in the Church*, as were they that denyed the *Re-'ſurrection*, urged Circumciſion, and deſpiſed 'the Apoſtles of Chriſt, in the Churches of *Co-'rinth* and *Galatia.* Others do charge theſe things not on the Church but Court of *Rome*, betwixt which two there might be ſome conſiderable diſtinction then, though now there is no difference betwixt them in any of thoſe Doctrines which concern the objects of their worſhip.

So Biſhop *Bramhal* frequently, Dr. *Potter.* §. 3. p. 76.

Dr. *Field* Append. part. 3. p. 281.

3. They add that 'the *Roman Church* that 'then was, though it had in it all the abuſes and 'ſuperſtitious obſervations it now hath, yet it had 'alſo others who deſired the removal of all thoſe 'abuſes and ſuperſtitious obſervations which we 'have removed; the *Roman Church* which then 'was, was the whole number of Chriſtians ſub-'ject to *Papal Tyranny*, whereof a great part de-'ſired nothing more than to ſhake off that yoke, 'which, as ſoon as he began to oppoſe himſelf, 'they preſently did; But the *Roman Church* that 'now is, is the multitude of ſuch only as do mag-'nifie, admire, and adore the plenitude of *Pa-'pal* power, or at leaſt are contented to be under 'the yoke of it ſtill. The groſs corruption of the ſervice of the Church was then complained of by all good men, and amongſt other Articles of Reformation they deſired that the *Breviaries* and *Miſſals* might be purged. Now in reſpect

Idem. Append. to his third Book of the Church. p. 190.

of

of thoſe perſons who were the *prevailing faction of the Church*, maintaining theſe *corrupt Doctrines* as *Articles* of Chriſtian Faith, and upholding theſe ſuperſtitious abuſes and pertinaciouſly perſiſting in their errors, the *Roman Church*, ſaith Dr. *Field*, 'was *verè Eccleſia* truly a Church, 'that is, a multitude of men profeſſing Chriſt, 'and Baptized, but not *vera Eccleſia* a true Church, that is a multitude of men holding a ſaving profeſſion of the truth in Chriſt. But in reſpect of thoſe who groaned under the yoke, who ſecretly diſliked and diſowned her corrupt Doctrines, and earneſtly deſired and wiſhed the Reformation of her ſuperſtitious abuſes, and of thoſe alſo who ſubmitted to them only for want of better information in thoſe obſcure times, the *Roman Church* was 'vera Eceleſia a true Church, that is 'a multitude of men holding a ſaving profeſſion 'of the truth in Chriſt. So the *Church* of the '*Jews* at the coming of *Chriſt* had in it the '*Scribes*, *Phariſees*, and *Saduces*, as well as *Za*-'*chary*, *Elizabeth*, *Simeon*, and *Anna*; in reſpect 'of the former it was truly a Church, but not a 'true Church; in reſpect of the latter it was a 'true Church. Append. 3. part p. 882.

Ob. But why then did not theſe perſons, if they were of any conſiderable number, more publickly oppoſe what they ſo much diſliked?

Anſw. If you look into Father *Pauls* Hiſtory of the *Council* of *Trent*, you will find them cenſuring moſt of their determinations, you will find there the *German Biſhops* determining againſt the adoration of *Images* in a *Provincial Council*, and declaring *that the Saints departed are to be honored but with the worſhip of ſociety and love, as alſo godly men may be honored in this Life.* Which P. 278, 279.

Expli-

Explications, ſaith Father *Paul*, being well conſidered do ſhew how much the opinions of the *Catholick Prelates* of *Germany* do differ from thoſe of the *Court* of *Rome*, you will there alſo find them quarrelling with that ſaying of the Synod *that Divine worſhip was due to the Sacrament, as improper*, and ſaying it was well corrected in the ſixth Canon which ſaid, *that the Son of God was to be worſhipt in the Sacrament.* 2. There was no reaſon to expect more open oppoſition of theſe Doctrines and abuſes, there being no probability of ſucceſs againſt the *Court* of *Rome* which was then very powerful, and had not only worſted mighty *Princes*, but uſed extreme ſeverity againſt ſuch diſſenters, deſtroying them without all mercy; which had all the *Biſhops* engaged to them by their oaths, and worldly intereſts, which laſtly declared all things *Hereſie* in which men differed from them, and proſecuted them, upon that account, with the extremeſt infamy and higheſt puniſhments: here then we have a true *Weſtern* Church, not *Idolatrous*, before the *Reformation*, in which Salvation might be had.

V. Mr. *Dodwel* Anſwer to Qu. 2. p. 59, 67.

Ob. 7. §. X. 'But ſaith *R. H.* if the Church of *Rome* be 'guilty of that *Idolatry* with which the Writers 'of the Church of *England* charge her, ſhe muſt 'be guilty of *Heatheniſh Idolatry*, for according to 'Dr. *Stillingfleet* and others, her *Idolatry* is the 'ſame with that of *Heathens*, and ſurely that 'excludeth from Salvation, and muſt be incon-'ſiſtent with a true Church.

Diſcourſe p. 76, 77.

Anſw. When we ſay the *Idolatry* of the *Church* of *Rome* is the ſame with that of *Heathens*, we do not mean that it is ſo either in reference to the object, *viz. thoſe evil ſpirits which the Heathens worſhiped*, or in reſpect of the rites with which

which they worſhipped their *Deacons*, viz. *human ſacrifices*, and *unclean performances*, but only in this reſpect that both of them do worſhip the creature for the Creator; or give that worſhip to the creature which belongs to God alone. 2. Although the *Papiſts* be in ſome ſingle actions guilty of *Idolatry*, yet do they in the general ſervice of their lives give God the honor due to him; they pray to God, truſt in him, they praiſe and love him, and perform to him all the poſitive duties of the firſt Table, though they do not perform them all to him *alone*, whereas the *Heathens* paid their whole worſhip to their *Demons*, and gave no worſhip to the God of *Iſrael*, they were *without God in the world*, ſaith B. *Paul*, and God was without ſervice from them, and even they that *knew God yet did not glorifie him as God*. Now that *Idolatry* which robs God of his whole ſervice, performing it intirely to evil ſpirits, or in an undue manner, may very well be *damnable*, and inconſiſtent with the being of a Church; whilſt that which is conſiſtent with the performance of all thoſe poſitive duties which we ow to God, and doth not wholly rob him of any part of our Religious worſhip, may not deſerve ſo hard a cenſure. This is apparent 1. From the inſtance of St. *Leo*, who ſpeaks of ſome fooliſh perſons who from ſome eminent places did adore the riſing Sun, 'a thing which ſome Chriſtians think they do ſo Religiouſly, that before 'they enter into the Church of St. *Peter* the Apoſtle, which is dedicated to the one true and living 'God, having got up the *Stairs* which lead to 'the aſcent of the High Altar, turning their bodies they bend them to the riſing Sun, bowing 'their necks in honor of that ſplendid Orb, which

Epheſ. ii. 12.

Rom. i. 21.

Sermon 7. in *Nativ. Dom.*

Quibus ad ſuggeſtum aræ ſuperioris aſcenditur.

we

'we are troubled to see done, partly out of igno-
'rance, and partly from a *Paganish* spirit. For
'though perhaps some worship rather the Crea-
'tor of this bright light, than the light it self
'which is a creature, yet ought they to abstain
'from the appearance of this service, which when
'one who hath left the worship of the *Gods*,
'shall find among us, will he not retain that part
'of his old opinion as probable, which he sees
'common to *Christians*, and to Heathens? Let
'therefore that perverseness which is to be con-
'demned, be rejected from the practice of the
'faithful. Nor let the honor which is due to God
'alone be mingled with their rites who serve the
'creature, for the Holy Scripture saith, *thou shalt*
Matth. iv. 10. '*worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou*
Job xxxi. 26, '*serve*. And blessed Job, *If I beheld the Sun*
28. '*when it shined, or the Moon walking in brightness*
'*and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my*
'*mouth hath kissed my hand, this is a very great ini-*
'*quity, and a denial of the most high God*: Where
1. Observe that he concludes this practice to be plain *Idolatry*, because, as he insinuates, it is the giving of that worship to the light, which is a creature, which is due only to the Creator of that light, It is, saith he, *the honor which is due to God alone*, the honor which is forbidden by Scripture which saith, *thou shalt worship the Lord thy God*, &c. and which good *Job* refused to do, because it was a virtual denyal of the God above. 2. Observe that it was *Heathenish Idolatry*, it was *Idolatry* proceeding, saith St. *Leo*, from a *Pagan* spirit, common to Christians with the *Heathens*, it was the old opinion of those who had left the *Heathen Worship*. And 3. Notwithstanding this, it was performed by some

Christi-

Christians from an apprehension that they were *Religious in so doing*, they therefore had no intention either to deny, or dishonor *God* by this service paid unto the *Sun*, and therefore St. *Leo* calls them *Christians*, and *beloved Christians*; he saith, they did it partly out of ignorance, and sins of ignorance we know, if they be generally repented of, exclude not from Salvation. 2. The *Host* not Consecrated is a meer creature, the *worship* therefore of the *Host* not Consecrated with *Latria*, must be *Idolatry*, because it is the giving of that *worship* to a creature which belongs alone to the Creator. And yet it may, and oft doth happen by the confession of the [a] *Romanists* through many secret defects, which do not fall under the Cognisance of him that worships, that the *Host* presented to the adoration of the people is not Consecrated; it therefore may, and oft doth happen, that they who absolutely worship with *Latria* the supposed *Host*, are guilty of *material Idolatry*; and yet I hope *R. H.* would not condemn all those to everlasting misery, who do incur this guilt in his own Church; here therefore is a second instance of *Idolatry* which in their own opinion is not *damnable*, nor doth exclude a person from being a true member of the Church: 3. It is ingenuously confessed by many *Romanists*, that many of the ruder sort among them are guilty of *Idolatry* (1.) in worshipping of *Images*: *For*, saith [b] Cornelius Agrippa, *it is not to be spoken how great superstition, I might say Idolatry, is fostered among rude people by Image-worship; while the Priests connive at these things, and make no small gain by it.* [c] Durandus Mimatensis saith, *that weak and simple people by indiscreet, and too much using of Images may be drawn*

[a] *Multæ sunt causæ propter quas potest accidere ut Christus non sit præsens: ut si sacerdos non sit Baptizatus, vel non sit ritè ordinatus, quod pendet ex multis aliis causis quibus fere in infinitum progredi possumus.* Suarez. in 3. Th. qu. 79. Art. 8. disp. 65. §. 2.

[b] *De vanit. Scient.* Cap. *de Imag.* where he also asks, *Cur auferimus gloriam Deo, tribuentes eam picturis ac statuis, ac si possent trahere in contemplationem Dei.*

[c] Durand. Rat. l. 1. c. 3. num. 4.

Biel. Canon. Miſſ. lect. 49. lit. v. p. 114. B. Conſult. Cap. de Imag. p. 206.

drawn to Idolatry. And *Gabriel Biel* adds that *ſome people are ſo fooliſh as that they think ſome Deity, or Sanctity to be in Images.* Caſſander ſaith, *it is more manifeſt than that it can be denyed, that the worſhip of Images and Idols hath too much prevailed, and the ſuperſtitious humor of people hath been ſo cockered that nothing hath been omitted among us either of the higheſt adoration, or vanity of* Painims, *in worſhipping and adoring Images.*

L. 6. *De invent Rerum* c. 13. p. 423.

Polydore Virgil complains that *the people are grown to ſuch madneſs that this Piety* (of Image-worſhip) *differs little from impiety. For there are many rude and ſtupid perſons who adore Images of wood, ſtone, marble, and braſs, or painted windows, not as ſigns, but as though they had ſenſe,* and they *repoſe more truſt in them than in Chriſt, or the Saints to whom they are dedicated.* Moreover they themſelves confeſs that where the worſhip of the Image of a Divine perſon is not *tranſitive*, but *terminative*, that is, where it ſtays in the Image, and paſſeth not to the exemplar; their Divine worſhip is terminatively given to the Image, that is unto a creature. Now ſeeing it is certain that the common people in worſhipping the Images of *Chriſt*, and of the *Bleſſed Trinity*, do oft not mind God, when they do cuſtomarily pay an act of adoration to theſe *Images*, much leſs direct that act by an intention of their minds unto the *Prototype*, their addreſs being then actually to the *Image*, and the mind not transferring it ſo much as by one thought towards the *Prototype*, it will neceſſarily terminate in the *Image*, if any where, and ſo be certainly *Idolatry*. A ſecond inſtance of this nature is in the worſhip of the Saints departed: For in this *Ludovicus Vives* doth confeſs that *many Chriſtians*

ſtians often ſin venerating Saints of both Sexs no otherwiſe than they ſerve God himſelf N. B. *neither do I ſee*, ſaith he, *in many of them what difference there is between their opinion concerning the Saints, and that which the Pagans held of their Gods*: *Claudius Eſpencæus* complains that in his time there were among them *old and decrepid Chriſtians who truſted, and attributed no leſs to Saints, than unto God himſelf*, concluding with this honeſt wiſh, *would to God I lyed, and that there were no perſons of this kind.* Now if *R. H.* will not condemn all theſe unto the Pit of *Hell*, he muſt acknowledg that ſome Idolatry may be conſiſtent with Salvation, although it be the ſame in kind with that of *Heathens.*

Annot. in Aug. de C. D. l. 8. c. 27. *Chriſtiani vetuli & ſeniculi qui non minus fidunt aut tribuunt divis quam Deo. utinam mentiar & nulli ſint hujuſmodi.* Annot. in 2 Tim. c. 3. p. 118. G.

F I N I S.